



A REPLY
TO
THE BISHOP OF EXETER'S
SECOND ARRAIGNMENT
OF
HIS METROPOLITAN
IN HIS
Letter to the Archdeacon of Totnes,
OPPUGNING
THE VALIDITY OF THE ORDERS OF THE FOREIGN
NON-EPISCOPAL CHURCHES.

TO WHICH IS ANNEXED,
A REJOINDER
TO
CHANCELLOR HARINGTON,
ON THE SAME SUBJECT.

"Diotrephes who loveth to have the pre-eminence.....Neither doth himself receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would, and casteth them out of the Church."—3 *John* 9, 10.

BY
W. GOODE, M.A., F.S.A.,

Rector of Allhallows the Great and Less, London.

Third Edition :

TO WHICH IS APPENDED A SUPPLEMENT CONTAINING FULL
ANSWERS TO THE REPLIES OF THE REV. W. R. SCOTT
AND THE REV. W. B. FLOWER.

LONDON:
THOMAS HATCHARD, 187, PICCADILLY.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY C. F. HODGSON,
GOUGH SQUARE, FLEET STREET.

CONTENTS.

REPLY TO THE BISHOP OF EXETER.

| | PAGE |
|---|--------|
| Preliminary remarks | 5, 6 |
| Bishop of Exeter's doctrine | 6, 7 |
| Archbishop of Canterbury's doctrine | 8 |
| On the Nineteenth Article | 8—10 |
| On the Twenty-third Article (containing citations from Bp. Pearson, Bp. Burnet, Foreign Prot. Churches, Rogers on the Articles, Bp. Tomline, Bp. Jewell, and Hooker) | 10—16 |
| On the Twenty-sixth Article | 16, 17 |
| On the English Ordinal | 17—23 |
| On a minister's supposed right to minister throughout the whole Church, with citation from Abp. Whitgift | 18, 19 |
| On the question of re-ordination, with extracts from Abps. Bramhall and Leighton, Bingham, and the Council of Nice | 20—22 |
| The Bishop's argument from the "Institution of a Christian Man," and the "Necessary Doctrine and Erudition" answered | 23, 24 |
| Vindication of my former reference to these Works | 24—26 |
| Vindication of my former reference to the Scholastic divines, shewing the Bishop's attack to be grounded upon a want of knowledge on the point in question, with extracts from Morinus and Dean Field on the whole subject | 26—34 |
| The view quoted from them supported by the Canons of Ecbright and Elfric, and the <i>fourth Council of Carthage</i> | 34, 35 |
| Reply to the Bishop's remarks respecting the divines of the reign of Edward VI., with reference to the views of Ridley, Philpot, Hooper, Cox, and Aylmer | 36 |
| Reply to the Bishop's remarks respecting the divines in the reign of Eli- zabeth, particularly Hooker and Bp. Bilson | 36—38 |
| Reply to the Bishop's quotations from Bps. Sanderson and Pearson | 38—43 |
| Reply to exceptions taken to my former testimonies, particularly that of Bp. Cosin | 43, 44 |
| The Bishop's mistake in his mode of arguing | 45 |
| Reply to the Bishop's remarks on the 55th Canon | 45—49 |
| Burnet's account of the consecration of the Scotch bishops in 1661 | 49 |
| Reply to various objections | 49, 50 |
| Recapitulation of former testimonies from divines of Queen Elizabeth's reign, namely: Bp. Alley, Bp. Pilkington, Dr. Whitaker, Bp. Jewell, Abp. Whitgift, Hooker, Saravia, Bp. Bridges, Bp. Cooper, Dr. Cosin. | 51, 52 |
| Correspondence of our early divines with the Foreign Protestant Mi- nisters | 52 |
| Cases of Scotch and Foreign Protestant Ministers allowed to minister in our Church without any fresh ordination | 52—54 |
| Any difficulty in this arose, not from the ecclesiastical but the statute law, proved from Bp. Hall | 54 |

| | |
|---|--------|
| Abp. Laud probably the first publicly to maintain that there could be no true Church without bishops | 55 |
| Extract from Mr. Hallam | 55, 56 |
| Reference to testimonies already given in former Tract from Bp. Andrews and Abp. Bramhall; also from Abps. Bancroft, Usher, Sancroft, Wake, Secker, and Howley, Bps. Hall, Davenant, Morton, George Downham, Cosin and Tomline, Lord Bacon, Deans Field and Sherlock, Archd. Mason, Drs. Crakanthorpe, Willet, and Claget | 56 |
| Additional testimonies from Bp. Hall, Dr. Crakanthorpe, Dr. J. White, Bp. F. White, Dr. J. Forbes, Bingham, Abp. Sharp, Abp. Tenison, and Dr. John Scott | 56—61 |
| General remarks on the remaining portion of the Bishop's "Letter." | 61, 62 |
| <i>Dr. Phillpotts' rebuke of Mr. Canning for speaking slightly of Calvinists.</i> | 63 |
| Reply to the extraordinary comments of the Bishop upon the Ordination Service of the French Reformed Church, <i>showing that his Lordship has effectually invalidated his own Orders and those of probably the whole Church</i> , with extracts from Morinus, Theodoret, Jerome, the Apostolical Constitutions, and the Ordination Services of the Greek Church | 63—69 |
| The Bishop's account of the French Service rectified | 69 |
| Reply to the Bishop's remarks on the 11th Canon of the French Reformed Church, in which the question of the indelibility of Holy Orders is considered, and answered from Bingham | 70—72 |
| Concluding remarks on the importance of united action among orthodox Protestants in opposition to the efforts of Popery and Infidelity; with observations on some statements of the Bishop of Oxford's recent Charge | 72—76 |

APPENDIX.

| | |
|---|-------|
| A REJOINDER TO CHANCELLOR HARINGTON'S PAMPHLET ENTITLED "A FEW WORDS," ETC. | 77—89 |
|---|-------|

SUPPLEMENT.

| | |
|---|-------------|
| I. ANSWER TO THE REPLY OF THE REV. W. R. SCOTT. | 91—101 |
| II. ANSWER TO THE REPLY OF THE REV. W. B. FLOWER. | 102 to end. |

REPLY TO THE BISHOP OF EXETER,

8c., 8c., 8c.

OF the many grievous errors which have been lately put forth in our Church under the name of genuine Church principles and Anglo-Catholic doctrine, there is not one, perhaps, more entirely opposed to the truth of the Gospel and the real doctrine of our Church, than that the only legitimate and promised channel through which the grace of God comes to mankind, is a ministry deriving its Orders from an Apostolically-descended Episcopate. This doctrine is the *πρωτον ψευδος*, the primary false principle, that is at the root of the present controversy among us on the question of Foreign Ordinations. How it is possible for ministers of our Church, in the face of all the testimonies that history sets before us of the close communion maintained by our early Reformers with the Protestant Continental Churches, to maintain such a view as the doctrine of the Church of England, it is difficult to understand. But recent experience seems to shew, that there are no bounds to the Romanizing doctrines which some among us can see clearly set forth in our Protestant Formularies.

To the Bishop of Exeter, and certain others among us, it is manifest as the sun at noon day, that the Orders of those who were recognised by our Reformers as esteemed fellow-ministers of Christ, and most dear colleagues in the Christian ministry, are pronounced by the Formularies drawn up by those very Reformers to be altogether invalid and null. But then, it must not be forgotten by the reader, that the same great authority has found his own doctrine of universal regeneration in baptism in the *Calvinistic* Confessions of the Foreign Protestant Churches; and has even, unconsciously, quoted the words of Calvin himself as bearing indubitable testimony to the truth of his view.

Whatever, therefore, be the amount of his Lordship's learning—a question into which I will not enter—it is clear that he has a prin-

ciple of interpretation ready upon all occasions, by which the writings of any individuals may be shewn most manifestly to set forth the doctrine he wishes to defend; even to the extent of making Calvin himself a maintainer of the *opus operatum* efficacy of the Sacraments, and proving those who fraternized with Non-Episcopalian churches and ministers, and considered them the very choicest portions of Christ's Church, and his favoured ambassadors to a fallen world, to be men who, in the Formularies they drew up, formally denounced those churches and ministers as uncatholic communities and mere pretenders to powers which they did not possess.

We may reasonably presume to doubt, however, whether this principle of interpretation will be as satisfactory to impartial inquirers as it seems to be to the Bishop of Exeter. But as his Lordship has now publicly come forward with an elaborate defence of his views in this matter, for the purpose of again arraigning his Metropolitan, at the bar of public opinion, for false doctrine and teaching opposed to that of his Church,* I venture to offer to the public the following remarks upon his statements. And I may the rather be permitted to do this, as, in the course of his pamphlet, he has, in a way with which we are all now painfully familiar, directly charged me with misrepresentation in my citation of certain authorities on this subject.

His Lordship's "Letter" has been called forth, he tells us, by the reply of the Archbishop of Canterbury to an Address to him from certain of the Clergy of the Diocese of Exeter, in which they desired "earnestly to record their conviction, in agreement with the judgment of our Church, consentient with that of the Catholic Church, that they only can be deemed validly ordained who have received 'the laying on of hands by those to whom the Apostolic succession has descended.'" In the reply of the Archbishop to this very modest production, in which a few presbyters take upon themselves to lay down the law to the Primate of their Church, and to pronounce *ex cathedra* what is "the judgment of our Church," and "that of the Catholic Church," his Grace took the opportunity of "protesting against the unwarranted assumption which it contained." Upon which the Bishop of Exeter thus comments,—“Believing as I do, that *this judgment of 220 of my clergy was substantially right*, and apprehending that the censure

* In "A Letter to the Archdeacon of Totnes, in answer to an Address from the Clergy of that Archdeaconry on the Necessity of Episcopal Ordination. By Henry, Lord Bishop of Exeter." Murray. 8vo. pp. 88.

passed upon it by the Archbishop, if it remain unnoticed, may lead to extensive and pernicious error, I deem it my duty to avow this my belief;" and he proceeds to fulfil "the duty of stating plainly and explicitly the grounds on which he rests it;" and he adds,—"*These grounds will, in the present instance, be limited to the authoritative teaching of our own Church, not diverging from it in any way, except to illustrate that teaching: for the question is, whether it be the judgment of our Church, that they only are truly ordained to the Christian ministry who have received Holy Orders from those to whom the power of conferring them has descended in succession from the Apostles.*" (pp. 12, 13.)

Such is the position which the Bishop of Exeter has taken upon himself to defend as *the doctrine of our Church*, proved to be so by her "authoritative teaching." The reader will observe, that the question to be discussed is not as to the *regularity* of Non-Episcopal Orders, but as to their *validity*; that is, whether persons so set apart have any right to perform anywhere the duties of the ministerial office, or to expect any Divine recognition or blessing in their performance of them. And if such Orders are not *valid*, then the Churches that have not Bishops "descending in succession from the Apostles," have none among them recognised by God as his ministers; they are entirely destitute of any persons holding the ministerial office; and, of course, subject to all the consequences resulting from such a state of things.

But as I am anxious that the Bishop's views should be fully stated before I proceed to investigate them, I will give him the entire benefit of a species of saving clause which he has thrown in, in one place, when pointing out the answer which he thinks ought to have been given by the Archbishop to Mr. Gawthorn's inquiry. He intimates that his Grace's answer ought to have been, that "he and the Church of England do hold Ordination by Bishops as necessary; *but yet, that we are not forbidden by the Church to hope, that, under the peculiar circumstances under which some of these foreigners are placed, their ministrations are not void.*" (p. 7.)

So that the limitation is this; that, while our Church holds that Non-Episcopal Ordinations are altogether invalid, and persons so ordained no ministers at all, yet if a member of it should venture to express a "hope," that the ministrations of "some" such, under some peculiar circumstances, "are not void," our Church has not directed that he should be punished for it. To call them ministers would indeed be a grave offence; but our

Church has not (the Bishop thinks) told her clergy,—You shall not indulge a *hope* that the ministrations of any such persons can be of any use. Our Church is charitable enough not to *anathematize* those who indulge such a *hope*. Such is the limitation with which the Bishop's position is to be connected. Will the reader expect me to take much further notice of it?

The judgment of the Archbishop, which it may be well also to state before I proceed further, is, that our Church does *not* “deny the validity of the Orders” of the Pastors of the Foreign Protestant Churches “solely on account of their wanting the imposition of Episcopal hands” (Letter to Gawthorn); while he at the same time maintains, “that Episcopal government, and therefore that Episcopal Ordination, is most agreeable to Scripture, most in accordance with primitive practice, and is in itself the ‘more excellent way.’” (Letter to Palmer.)

Which of these two views is most consistent with the doctrine of the Church of England, we are now to inquire.

The Bishop commences his argument with an appeal to the Formularies of our Church, particularly those parts which had been referred to by the Archbishop as expressing doctrine with which his views were “in exact accordance;” namely, the 19th and 23rd Articles, and the Preface to the Ordinal; and out of these he constructs, by a long process of argumentation and inferential reasoning, aided by divers additions *ab extra*, a system of church-government suited to his views. I must endeavour to follow him in the mazes of the labyrinth he has constructed, and through whose devious and winding paths he has reached his conclusions. His Lordship's mode of argumentation on such occasions strongly reminds one of the ingenious method by which the cuttle-fish is accustomed to elude the grasp of its pursuers; namely, by pouring forth an inky fluid which so darkens the waters through which it takes its course, that their powers of vision are completely unequal to the task of tracking its path. And I doubt much, whether our venerable Reformers would be able to recognise their own Formularies, if presented to them in the state in which they re-appear after having been subjected to the action of that potent fluid.

The 19th Article is “Of the Church,” and stands thus,—“The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to God's ordinance, in all things that of necessity be requisite to the same.”

From this his Lordship deduces three positions; *first*, that in any body professing to be a Church of Christ, “the pure word of God” is to be preached, a deduction which I shall not dispute. *Secondly*, it must be “*preached*,” “*THAT IS*,” says his Lordship, “publicly set forth for the instruction of the people *by persons duly empowered, or sent, for that purpose*; for we know from St. Paul that the word cannot be ‘preached’—that is, not merely recited or taught, but *proclaimed with assurance and authority*—except by those who are duly ‘sent,’ authorized by Him whose word they proclaim, *κηρυκες*—men unto whom God ‘hath committed the word of reconciliation.’” (p. 14.)

Now I beg to ask, where does his Lordship find all this *in the Article*? The Article merely uses the word “preached.” Does his Lordship really suppose, that any one in search of truth will allow him to raise out of this single word his whole doctrine of the sort of commission necessary to qualify a man for preaching the Gospel? Has he forgotten that even laymen were sometimes allowed to preach in the early Church, and that in the presence of a bishop? Or, still more, has he forgotten that “they which were scattered abroad, upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, travelled as far as Phenice and Cyprus and Antioch, *preaching the word*, &c. And the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number believed and turned unto the Lord.” (Acts xi. 19—21.) Or (to mention no more) has he forgotten Apollos, who, when “knowing only the baptism of John,” and therefore certainly not *ordained* by any apostle or Christian bishop, “spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord,” which I suppose amounts to *preaching*; and after receiving further instruction from Aquila and Priscilla, “helped them much which had believed through grace; for he mightily convinced the Jews, and that *publicly*, shewing by the Scriptures that Jesus was Christ.” (Acts xviii. 24, &c.) All these, it seems, knew nothing of the Bishop of Exeter’s doctrine, that nobody might, or even *could*, “preach,” but one specially ordained and publicly set apart by Divine commission for the purpose.

Of course I am not here touching the question of the necessity of an inward Divine call and qualification for being an ambassador of Christ, or of what Apostolical practice teaches us to be proper for the due appointment of a preacher of the Gospel in a regularly constituted Church. All I wish now to point attention to, is the absurdity (for I can use no milder term) of attempting to raise a

whole system of church-government out of the single word "preach."

His Lordship's *third* deduction is, that as the Article requires, that in a Church "the Sacraments be duly ministered in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same," and the 25th Article says, that sacraments are "effectual signs of grace, &c., by which God doth work invisibly in us," &c.; and a Homily says, that "in them God embraceth us," &c.; "manifestly therefore among 'those things that of necessity are requisite to the duly ministering the same' must be *authority from God*, given to those who minister them;" and it is added, that "our Church has not left the point to be deduced by our sense of what is right: it is expressly declared in the 26th Article, that they who minister the Sacraments 'do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by *his commission and authority*;" and hence the consequence is deduced, that the Sacraments can only be "duly ministered" "by those who have *commission and authority from God* given to them for that purpose;" in other words, individuals divinely commissioned "for that purpose." Now one single consideration annihilates the whole of this argumentation; for if it were correct, lay-baptism would be wholly invalid, which the Bishop well knows is not the doctrine of our Church; and therefore his third deduction is as groundless as his second. The question whether non-episcopally ordained ministers may not be said to minister by Christ's commission and authority, is one that will more properly come under consideration in reviewing the meaning of the 23rd Article; to which the Bishop next directs our attention.

This Article is entitled, "Of ministering in the Congregation," and runs thus—"It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching or ministering the Sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard."

It is difficult to understand, how any one can read this Article, and not see how carefully it is worded so as not to exclude from "lawful calling" the ministers of the Foreign Protestant Churches. As Professor Hey says, in his Commentary on the Articles, the expression "who have public authority given unto them in the

congregation,” “seems to leave the *manner* of giving the power of ordaining quite free: it seems as if any religious society might, consistently with this Article, appoint officers, with power of Ordination, by election, representation, or lot; as if, therefore, the right to ordain did not depend upon any uninterrupted *succession*.” (Lect. in Div. vol. iv. p. 166.) And when we recollect the nature of the intercourse and communion that took place between our Reformers and those Churches and their ministers, both at the time when these Articles were first drawn up, in the reign of Edward VI., and at their re-establishment in the reign of Elizabeth, there is but one way of accounting for a long argumentation, an effusion of ink covering EIGHTEEN pages, to prove that by “men to whom public authority is given,” &c., the Article “*must mean Bishops*” (!) and that “*our Church holds that the power of Ordination is in Bishops only.*” (!!) (p. 33.) Painful as the task is of taking to pieces such a web of sophistry, such a tissue of false reasoning and perversion of plain statements, the position of the writer makes it necessary to guard the public mind against such a representation of the doctrine of our Church.

His Lordship commences by observing, that by the Article it is “not lawful” to “execute the ministry in the Church” without “a lawful call and mission.” His Lordship is quite aware, as he afterwards informs us, that this is held by his opponents as much as by himself (p. 20), and therefore it might have been supposed, that he would at once have passed on to something relevant to the question in hand. But it appears, that by some obliquity of vision, of a very unenviable kind, he saw in it an opportunity of flinging against the Primate a charge of fraternizing with Socinians in the matter. He is “aware” that “Hammond had to defend the Apostle’s precept” as to “mission” being “requisite for teaching in the Church;” and “against whom?” — “against Volkeli^{us} and other disciples of *Socinus*, whom he asserts ‘to be certainly the first that from the beginning of Christianity have in this controversy appeared against us.’” To which his Lordship thinks himself justified in appending the following remark,—“This is a sad pedigree; and it behoves those who are unconsciously using the words and arguments of *Socinus* and his followers, to ponder their founder’s purpose in using them—which was no other than to assail the faith, by disparaging the Divine mission of its heralds and guardians.” (p. 17.)

Hoping, I suppose, that the reader would be so mystified by his statements as to identify *all* "mission" with that which the Bishop considers *proper* "mission;" and that he would overlook the fact, that the Bishop's own quotation from Hammond condemns him,—for its terms virtually except the Foreign Protestant Churches from the charge of not thinking any mission requisite—he hurls against the Primate a reproach, which his own statements prove to be groundless. Considering the quarter from which it comes, I content myself with thus pointing it out.

Into his Lordship's theological lucubrations, occupying the next two pages, I shall not enter. What we are inquiring about is the doctrine laid down in the Article. But he concludes thus:—"But is all mission now unnecessary? Mission from God himself? The Catholic Church hath from the beginning held the contrary; and our own Church, as a faithful part of it, has in the 23rd Article proclaimed the same truth—the necessity of lawful mission generally in the former of its two propositions—in the latter, *THE NECESSITY that this mission be mediately from God, TRANSMITTED BY SUCCESSION FROM THOSE WHO, AT THE FIRST, RECEIVED THE POWER OF THUS GIVING IT IMMEDIATELY FROM OUR LORD HIMSELF.*" (pp. 19, 20.) Such is the doctrine which his Lordship has the courage to assert is *laid down in the latter part of the Article!* He admits, indeed, that it is "not so plainly expressed;" and as the Primate has called it an "unwarranted assumption," he proceeds "to defend it publicly in the face of the Church."

His Lordship says,—“There are three several members of the proposition which we are considering.—I. That lawful mission to the Christian ministry must be from God by an outward call. II. That we must not look for any outward call from God except mediately through men. III. That it must be given through men who have themselves received the power of transmitting it, publicly given to them by those who have themselves publicly received the power of giving that power from others similarly empowered; in other words, in uninterrupted succession from the Apostles themselves.” (p. 20.)

Now here it is obvious, that his Lordship has drawn from the Article propositions not contained in it. The Article does not touch the question of the call "*from God,*" but only that of the external call by men. To assert therefore that the Article says that lawful mission must be "*from God* by an outward call" is a direct and palpable misrepresentation of it.

And the Bishop's own authority, Bishop Pearson, whom he so highly extols (p. 52)—and not without reason—might have shewn him, and in the very passage to which he has referred us, his error in introducing these words into the Article. For Bishop Pearson, treating of the mode of Ordination in the Church of England, says,—“*Ordinaria vocatio fit a Deo et per homines. Quatenus est a Deo, est interna; quatenus est per homines, est externa.*” (Minor Theol. Wks. i. 291, 292.)

In defence of the third proposition the Bishop argues thus,—that when the Article says that the persons through whom lawful mission must be given, are “men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation,” it clearly means that this power is “so given *by God—publicè in Ecclesia*; that is, in some outward manner by which it shall be publicly known in the Church to be given;” the Divine Being being represented, after the first bestowal of the power, by a succession of representatives of those to whom the power was first given. For, says the Bishop, “as these [*i. e.* modern Bishops who give power of mission] must in like manner have received their power of mission from others, who had received it in like manner, the series must be carried backwards, until, as we before said, it reaches the Apostles, whom our Lord sent, ‘as the Father had sent Him,’ *i. e.* with power to send others.” (p. 22.)

This is the foundation on which his whole argumentation rests; and it is clearly derived from his ADDING words to the Article calculated to carry out his own views. The Article clearly implies, that there is power *in a Church* to authorize certain of its members to call and appoint others to the office of the ministry, which exactly meets the case of the Foreign Protestant Churches. The words “authority given unto them *by God* in the Congregation,” are very different from what we find in the Article. They would imply, that the Congregation, or Church, had no voice in the matter, and could not authorize any of their body to do any act of the kind. So that the words which the Bishop has thus foisted into the Article completely change the character of its doctrine. They just determine what the Article has studiously left open, and determine it in opposition to the known sentiments of those who drew up the Article. They make it necessary, that the mission should be given by some individual or individuals specially and individually and publicly commissioned by God himself, apart from the Church, to bestow it; while the terms of the Article imply that God has left sufficient power with the Church to act in such a matter.

The Article is evidently drawn up so as to *comprehend* the Foreign Protestant Churches. It does not pretend to define exactly what our own Church's particular mode of calling and sending ministers is; but it states the limits of what may be considered a lawful calling. Most just and pertinent are the remarks of Bishop Burnet, in his Exposition of this Article.

"If," he says, "a company of Christians find the public worship where they live to be so defiled that they cannot with a good conscience join in it, and if they do not know of any place to which they can conveniently go, where they may worship God purely and in a regular way; if, I say, such a Body finding some that have been ordained, though to the lower functions, should submit itself entirely to their conduct; or, *finding none of those, should by a common consent desire some of their own number to minister to them in holy things*, and should upon that beginning grow up to a regulated constitution, though we are very sure that this is quite out of all rule, and could not be done without a very great sin, unless the necessity were great and apparent; yet if the necessity is real and not feigned, *this is not condemned or annulled by the Article*; for when this grows to a constitution, and when it was begun by the consent of a Body who are supposed to have an authority in such an extraordinary case, whatever some hotter spirits have thought of this since that time, *yet we are very sure, that not only those who penned the Articles, but the body of this Church for above half an age after, did, notwithstanding those irregularities, acknowledge the Foreign Churches so constituted to be true Churches as to all the essentials of a Church, though they had been at first irregularly formed, and continued still to be in an imperfect state.* AND THEREFORE THE GENERAL WORDS IN WHICH THIS PART OF THE ARTICLE IS FRAMED, SEEM TO HAVE BEEN DESIGNED ON PURPOSE NOT TO EXCLUDE THEM."

In fact, the Article requires nothing more as necessary for lawful calling, than what is required in the Confessions of several of the Foreign Protestant Non-Episcopal Churches; as for instance, the Helvetic (Art. 16), Bohemian (c. 9), and Belgic (Art. 31). And therefore the Bishop might just as well attempt to fasten his doctrine upon the Confessions of these Non-Episcopal Churches as upon that of the Church of England.

I have already pointed out in a former publication,* that the first Exposition of the Articles—that by Rogers, Chaplain to Archbishop Bancroft, which was published in 1607, as "perused and by the lawful authority of the Church of England allowed to be public," and which the Archbishop (a High-Churchman) ordered all the parishes in his province to supply themselves with,—interprets the Article in this way, and points out its *agreement* with

* The Doctrine of the Church of England on Non-Episcopal Ordinations.

the Confessions I have just referred to ; and so also does the late High-Churchman, Bishop Tomline.*

Indeed the only way in which the Bishop of Exeter can force his doctrine out of the Article, is by garbling it by the addition of words which totally alter its obvious meaning. And presuming, I suppose, upon the ignorance of his readers, he ventures even to quote, in support of his view of it, the Apology of Bishop Jewell, which he correctly tells us "had the grateful sanction of that very Synod in which our present Articles were compiled." Now, not to mention Bishop Jewell's notorious recognition of certain of the Foreign Protestant Churches and their ministers,—which alone would render such a reference deserving of unqualified censure,—the fact is, that the Confession of Faith of the English Church (including this question of Orders), inserted by Bishop Jewell in his Apology, was placed by the Foreign Reformers in the Harmony of the Confessions of the Reformed Churches published at Geneva in 1581, as one with which all the rest were in agreement.

And so completely opposed is Hooker to the Bishop's interpretation of the Article, that he distinctly intimates that there is no "heavenly law" whereby it may appear, "that the Lord himself hath appointed presbyters for ever to be under the regiment of Bishops," and that "their authority" is "a sword which *the Church hath power to take from them*" (Eccl. Pol. vii. 5) ; and expressly says that "the whole Church visible" is "the true original subject of all power ;" and that though "*it* hath not ordinarily ALLOWED any other than Bishops alone to ordain, howbeit as the ordinary course is ordinarily in all things to be observed, so it may be, in some cases, not unnecessary that we decline from the ordinary ways ;" and that "there may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow Ordination made without a Bishop." (Ib. 14.)

The Bishop's remarks upon Bishop Burnet's Commentary on the Articles, which he finds most inconveniently in his way, I leave to their fate.

The quotation from a posthumous work of Bishop Beveridge, which it does not appear that he left for publication, and which was said by some, at the time of its first appearance, to have been a juvenile work of its author, cannot override the plain language of the Article. There is not one word in the Article that even *implies* the necessity of Ordination by an apostolically-descended Episcopate.

* Expos. of Articles, ed. 1799. p. 376.

Before I pass on, I must notice a very remarkable piece of verbal criticism on the part of his Lordship. No one, I suppose, can have perused the various recent publications that have issued from his Lordship's pen, without observing the happy ingenuity with which he occasionally mystifies his admiring readers, by the profound discrimination with which he brings to light some nice turns of expression in the documents he is quoting, proving beyond contradiction how exactly they fall in with his doctrine. So remarkable an illustration of this occurs here, that I must beg permission to present it to the reader. "This, then," says the Bishop, "I scruple not to accept, and to commend to others, as a sound and irrefragable statement of the real import of the Article; inviting, in confirmation of it, attention to the *reverential tone* in which the Article is conceived,—‘Atque illos legitime vocatos existimare debemus.’ *This is language highly becoming those who recognise God as the author of lawful mission*, but would hardly be used to designate a call from man. In that case we should rather expect a categorical declaration that such persons *are* called.” (p. 26.) So that if I was to say, the Bishop of Exeter *ought to consider* such and such persons lawfully called, I should be using a “reverential tone” in the matter, which would shew that I recognised God, and not man, as the author of their mission. Alas! my poor brains are too dull for such transcendental discrimination.

His Lordship proceeds to cite the 26th Article in confirmation of his view of the meaning of the 23rd. This Article says, that the ministers of the Church minister “in Christ's name,” and “by his commission and authority;” from which it is argued: “This recognition of ministers exercising their ministry in Christ's name, and by his commission, negatives all merely human authority in their appointment.” (p. 27.) But this does not touch the real question at issue; which, in fact, his Lordship, throughout his argumentation, from whatever cause, altogether ignores. The question is, whether the power of giving the outward call to men to preach and administer the Sacraments, and of conferring that power upon others, was so exclusively given by Christ to the Apostles, and by the Apostles to the Bishops they appointed, that none other of his followers but those having apostolically-derived power in this respect can, under any circumstances, exercise or confer it. Now this supposed *exclusive* gift is just what is to be proved, but what his Lordship throughout his argument *assumes*. It does not necessarily follow, that a mission to ex-

ecute the ministerial office is by mere human authority, because it is not given by a Bishop deriving his authority by regular succession from the Apostles. And, as I have shewn before, a host of our best divines do not hold it to be so.* Our learned Dean Field, in his standard work “Of the Church,” elaborately defends the position, that presbyters have, so far as the capabilities given to them in their Ordination extend, power equally with Bishops to do all things necessary for the maintenance of God’s service, “and that *only* for order’s sake and the preservation of peace, there is a limitation of the USE and EXERCISE of the same,” confining it to Bishops.† And therefore, even supposing that this limitation originated with the Apostles, and still more if it originated with the subsequent Church, as Jerome and many other of the ancients maintained, circumstances might fully justify its being laid aside. And, moreover, it must be recollected, that it is Christ’s own act in calling any one by his Spirit, and qualifying him for his service, that more especially constitutes any one *his* minister, not the *mere* outward commission of man, which ensures nothing but the bare *validity* of his ministerial acts.

But the 23rd Article, says his Lordship, “leaves to a subsequent Article, the 36th, to tell us who they are to whom this power is given ;” the 36th Article sanctioning the Ordinal. (p. 27.) And here we find one of those specimens of unfairness, the constant occurrence of which, in his Lordship’s latter publications, deprives one of all confidence in his statements. He quotes the Preface to the Ordinal as it was altered at the Review in 1661, as if it was thus put forth by the framers of the Articles, giving not the slightest intimation to the reader of there being any difference between the two, though the difference is of importance in the point under discussion, and was fully noticed in a Tract then lying under his Lordship’s eyes, and criticised by him a few pages further on! Nay, at a subsequent part of his argument (p. 63), it became convenient to notice this fact, and consequently there we find it. It does not indeed, of course, make the sense of the 23rd Article different from what it was before ; but it commits our Reformers to a higher view of the importance of Episcopal Ordination than they in reality took.

The Bishop gives the passage thus—“To the intent that these Orders should be continued and reverently used and esteemed in

* See Doctrine of Church of England on Non-Episcopal Ordinations.

† See the whole passage below, pp. 31—34.

the Church of England," "no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of England, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the form hereafter following, *or hath formerly received Episcopal consecration or ordination.*"

And in his Lordship's observations upon this passage, he lays the greatest stress upon the concluding words, "or hath formerly received Episcopal consecration or ordination." Now these words, as his Lordship well knows, were not inserted till the revision of the Book in 1661, by the Laudian divines, who then had the upper hand. He knows also, upon the testimony of the High Churchman Bishop Cosin, and others,* lying before him when he wrote, that, in the previous period of our Church, persons having only Presbyterian Orders were admitted to minister in our Church, and that it was the general opinion of the Bishops that there was nothing to prevent this. Hence, not only was there evidence, that our Church admitted the validity of the Orders of the Foreign Protestant Churches, so far as those churches themselves were concerned, but persons so ordained were allowed to minister in our own Church. And the insertion of those words in 1661, requiring Episcopal Ordination for *those who minister in our Church*,—obviously with a view to the Presbyterians, who, in the civil war, had usurped the places of the Episcopalian clergy,—cannot affect the doctrine of our Church on the abstract question, whether the Foreign Protestant Churches are destitute of any validly ordained pastors.

The direction here given, as it stood both before and after the Review in 1661, is strictly limited to what is required "*in the Church of England.*" There is a marked abstinence from any statement of the necessity of Episcopal Orders for a valid ministry, which it is impossible to conceive that our Reformers would have observed, if they had held the Bishop of Exeter's notions. And when we couple this with their known conduct towards the Foreign Protestant Churches, not the smallest doubt can be left upon the mind of any reasonable inquirer after *the truth* that they did not hold them.

But the Bishop supports his view by two arguments. The first is this. He says: "If persons from Berlin and Geneva, calling themselves ministers of Christ's Church, are really such ministers,

* See "Doctrine, &c.," pp. 29, 3

it would be a direct act of schism for our Church to reject their ministry; for all who are Christ's ministers at all, are his ministers throughout his whole Church." (p. 30.) But what a mere cobweb is this! Has not a Church a right to say to those ministers who come here from a Church under a different form of government, "We have laid down a rule which we consider most in accordance with Apostolical usage, requiring a certain mode of introduction to the ministry among us, and we think it inexpedient to break it by admitting others not so qualified?" Does it follow from this, that our Church holds them to be destitute of all right to exercise the ministerial office anywhere? Where does his Lordship derive his authority for denying to his Church such a prudential mode of action, and shutting her up to the alternative of either admitting to hold office in her communion any minister of a Foreign Church, whatever its form of government may be, or denying that such a one has any right to exercise the ministerial office to any body of Christians on the face of the earth? The fact is, that his Lordship has in this point, as well as in his advocacy of the exclusive admissibility of one form of Ecclesiastical government, been following in the steps of the early Puritans. His own words are almost identical with those of the notorious Puritan Travers to Archbishop Whitgift. Travers, to shew that he had a right to be allowed to minister in the Church of England, though having only Presbyterian Orders (and he could hardly be said to have any), urged, that "the universal and perpetual practice of all Christendom, in all places, and in all ages, proveth the ministers lawfully made in any Church of sound profession in faith, ought to be acknowledged such in any other;" he means, so as to be allowed to *minister* in it. To which Archbishop Whitgift, (who, as we know from his writings, *admitted the validity of the Orders of the Foreign Protestant Churches*, but held that "*the laws of this realm require that such as are to be allowed as ministers in this Church of England should be ordered by a Bishop, and subscribe to the Articles before him,*") replies to the argument thus:—"Excepting always such Churches as allow of Presbytery, and practise it." He considered that in such a case an Episcopal Church might fairly object to one not ordained as she required acting as one of *her own* ministers. But he did not deny the validity of Presbyterian Orders in the abstract. In the same paper to which I am now referring, he admits that Whittingham "was ordained minister by those which *had authority* in the

Church" in which he was ordained, though he held such Orders not a sufficient qualification for ministering in the Church of England. (See Strype's Whitgift, App. Bk. 3. n. 30.)

The second argument is this, that if any of the ministers of Non-Episcopal Churches wish to be ministers of the Church of England, "they must, as a preliminary, renounce all claim at present to any ministerial character whatsoever," and "present themselves as lay candidates for holy orders;" "and yet for our Church thus to insist on their submitting to be ordained anew, if they already have Orders, would be, *not merely an act of schism, but a manifest desecration of Christ's ordinance, a most sinful rejection of his commission.*" (pp. 30, 31.)

High-sounding words these, no doubt, and very characteristic of their author. But the question is, What truth is there in them? None at all. There is no such "renunciation" required. And the whole notion about the "desecration of Christ's ordinance" involved in such a step, is entirely opposed to the views of our best divines of all parties. What does the High-Churchman Archbishop Bramhall say, in his Letters of Orders, when ordaining one who had previously had only Scotch Presbyterian Orders,—*"Non annihilantes priores ordines (si quos habuit), nec invaliditatem eorundem determinantes, multo minus omnes ordines sacros Ecclesiarum Forinsecarum condemnantes, quos proprio Judici relinquimus, sed SOLUMMODO SUPPLENTES quicquid prius defuit per canones Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ requisitum, et providentes paci Ecclesiæ, ut schismatis tollatur occasio, et conscientiis fidelium satisfiat, nec ulli dubitent de ejus ordinatione, aut actus suos presbyteriales tanquam invalidos aversentur."* (Works, Oxf. ed., vol. i. p. xxxvii.)

Let his Lordship's friends determine which is the best authority, the Bishop of Exeter or Archbishop Bramhall.

But as this is an important point, I shall add some further testimonies.

And, first, let us hear the opinion of Archbishop Leighton, one whose learning as well as piety is unquestionable. When consecrated Bishop, in 1661, by some of the English Bishops, he was required by them to submit to be first ordained Deacon and Priest, on the ground partly of the Act of Uniformity, and partly that, though it might be reasonable to allow Presbyterian Orders under some circumstances, yet that his had been received from those who were in a state of schism, and had without reason revolted from their

bishops.* And Leighton's view on the subject is thus stated by his intimate friend Bishop Burnet,—“ Leighton did not stand much upon it. He *did not think Orders given without bishops were null and void*. He thought the forms of government were not settled by such positive laws as were unalterable ; but only by Apostolical practices, which, as he thought, authorized Episcopacy as the best form. Yet he did not think it necessary to the being of a Church. *But he thought that every Church might make such rules of Ordination as they pleased, and that they might reordain all that came to them from any other Church ; and that the reordaining a priest ordained in another Church imported no more, but that they received him into Orders according to their rules, and did not infer the annulling the Orders he had formerly received.*” (Hist. of his own Times, vol. i. p. 140.)

The testimony of Archbishop Leighton, therefore, is directly against the Bishop on *all* the points of the case.

But a still more important testimony perhaps than even these is that of the learned Bingham, the author of the “ Antiquities of the Christian Church.” He says, in his “ French Church's Apology for the Church of England,”—

“ Nor do I see what can be urged further in this case, unless it be the business of reordination, which some reckon so great a charge against the Act of Uniformity ; because it obliges every beneficiary to receive Episcopal ordination, according to the form and rites of the Church of England. *But what harm there is in this, I confess I never yet could see ;* and I am sure there is nothing in it contrary to the principles or practice of Geneva, nor perhaps of the whole French Church. For at Geneva it is their common practice, whenever they remove a minister from one Church to another, to give him a new and solemn ordination by imposition of hands and prayer. . . . Now if it be lawful, by the rules of the Church of Geneva, for a minister to receive a new solemn ordination, when he is translated from one Church to another ; why cannot men in England consent to receive a new ordination, when the law requires it, in order to settle themselves regularly in any Church ? especially when *it is for the sake of peace and union*, and to take off all manner of doubtfulness and scruples from the people. *I dispute not now, whether their former ordinations were valid ;* [this question, we see, he does not consider to affect the point to be determined, namely, whether they could properly submit to reordination ;] it is certain, they are not more valid than those of Geneva ; nor can they themselves think them more valid than the ministers of Geneva think theirs : wherefore if it be lawful at Geneva for a minister to receive a new ordination, because the laws require it, I do not see what can make it unlawful in England to submit to the same thing, in compliance with the law, when men have no other regular way to settle themselves in any

* I shall revert presently to their view on this point. See p. 49.

cure; let their opinion of their former ordination be what it will, WHICH COMES NOT INTO THE PRESENT DISPUTE. For even supposing their former ordination [i. e. the Presbyterian in this country] to be valid, I shew they may submit to a new ordination without sin: and if they will be peaceable, they ought to do it, after the example of Geneva, rather than set up separate meetings, and preach against the will of their superiors, to the disturbance of the peace of the Church." (Bingham's Works, vol. ix., ed. 1845, pp. 296, 297.)

I might add other authorities, but after these it is needless to do so.

I am as well aware as the Bishop of Exeter can be of the decisions of the early Church against reordinations, and, in the state of things which then existed, can quite enter into their propriety. But the circumstances of the Church were then different; and those decisions are no more binding upon us than many that are totally disregarded by all parties. And after all, they only laid down the general rule; for we are not without some precedent for such reordinations even in the early Church. For the great Council of Nice directed, that those who had been ordained by Meletius, after he had been deposed by his Metropolitan, were not to be admitted to minister in the Church until they had been qualified to do so by a "*more sacred Ordination*" (μυστικωτέρα χειροτονία βεβαιωθέντας).* The *validity* of the Ordination is not denied, as it could hardly be, but the defects of its *irregularity* are supplied. It could no more be invalid than those of the Donatists, which we know from Augustine were admitted, in those that came over to the Church, as sufficient to enable them to minister in the Church without any fresh Ordination.

"But," adds his Lordship, "we have not yet done with the Preface to the Book of Consecration and Ordination. In truth, its very first words, duly considered, are conclusive of the whole question:—'It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been three orders of ministers in Christ's Church, bishops, priests, and deacons.' Now, were these orders appointed by man or God? *No one amongst us can hesitate what answer to give—undoubtedly by God.*" And then, having pointed out the offices and powers which our Ordinal attributes to each, his Lordship seems to suppose that his work is done, and his wished-for conclusion made good.

Now I should be abusing the patience of the reader to attempt any elaborate confutation of such an argument as this. The

* Epist. Synod. ap. Socrat. lib. i. c. 9.

veriest tyro in these matters knows, that there is no ground whatever to attribute the existence of these three Orders to a direct appointment of God. The utmost that can be said is, that they were appointed by the Apostles, who were divinely inspired to deliver the Gospel message to mankind, and therefore, so far as was necessary for this purpose, under Divine guidance; but as to their ecclesiastical arrangements, we have no proof that they had any express Divine direction, still less that the polity they adopted was unalterable. The extracts I have formerly given* from the works of many of our greatest divines render it unnecessary to say a word more on this point.

I have now gone carefully through the whole of the Bishop's proof of his positions derived from the Formularies of our Church; and I willingly leave the reader to form his own opinion upon the two conclusions to which the Bishop would lead him; namely,—“1st. That the words of our Church's 23rd Article, ‘by men to whom public authority,’ &c., *must mean bishops*: and 2ndly. That our Church holds that the power of Ordination is in bishops *only*.” (p. 33.)

His Lordship having thus concluded his argument upon the Formularies of our Church, proceeds to deal with our Reformers in a similar way. “The doctrine,” he observes, “which has been thus severely censured from the highest place, was the doctrine of our earliest Reformers.” And to prove it to be so, he proceeds to quote two works notoriously written before they had given up the errors of Popery on various important points; works published during the reign of Henry VIII., and which advocate the seven Sacraments, images and crucifixes in churches, holy water, creeping to the cross, prayer for the dead, *et id genus omne*; namely, the “Institution of a Christian Man,” and the “Necessary Doctrine.” Such references, however, have this great advantage, that they shew us the desperate shifts to which his Lordship's cause is reduced, when he can condescend to make so transparent an attempt to mislead his readers. In these two works his Lordship announces that he found the power of Ordination attributed only to bishops. I congratulate him upon the discovery of so important a help to his cause. Let us hope that his Lordship will not search further in the mine he has opened, for the next thing perhaps may be the discovery that the Reformers held almost all the doctrines which the world has been in the habit of

* See my “Doctrine of the Church of Eng. on Non-Episc. Ordinations.”

thinking that they repudiated, and then in what a position shall we be placed ! I will grant his Lordship, then, all the benefit which his extracts from those works can bring him, though I might take exception to them as being themselves insufficient for his purpose; and with these remarks I should have left them to their fate, but for a very characteristic attack of his Lordship upon myself; to which, however unwilling to detain the reader with any personal matters, and however indifferent to any such charges from such a quarter, I am bound to offer a few remarks in reply; and shall avail myself of the opportunity of giving further information on the whole subject.

At the commencement of my argument on this matter in a former Tract,* before giving the proofs we have of our early Reformers holding the doctrine of the validity under some circumstances of Presbyterian Ordinations, I noticed the fact, that even before the Reformation a doctrine was held which opens the door to such a view, namely, that bishops and priests are of one and the same ministerial order. I observed that, “at the very dawn of the Reformation, the bishops and clergy of our Church put forth a document containing the very doctrine on which the validity of Presbyterian Ordinations has been *chiefly* rested, namely, the parity of bishops and presbyters with respect to the ministerial powers essentially and by right belonging to them;” and shewed that this view was maintained in the “Institution of a Christian Man,” and the “Necessary Doctrine;” and then remarked, that “this view certainly *goes far* to remove the difficulty as to recognising the validity of Presbyterian Ordination in the absence of bishops;” carefully (as the reader will see) recognising the *distinction* between the *two* views; namely, the parity of order in bishops and presbyters, and the validity of Presbyterian Ordinations; and only observing that the former view *went far* to remove the difficulty there is in receiving the latter. And in the remarks immediately following, as to the opinions of certain divines of our Church put on record about the same period, I noticed how *some* thought that bishops and priests were of the same order, and “some were prepared to take *the next step*, and grant to presbyters under some circumstances the power to ordain presbyters;” still keeping the two views perfectly distinct. The object of course was, to shew that the prevalence of this view at the very dawn of the Reformation easily *led the way* to the view afterwards adopted by our Reformers, of the validity under some circumstances of Presbyterian Ordina-

* Doctrine of the Church of England on Non-Episcopal Ordinations, &c., reprinted from the “Christian Observer;” which of course accounts for its being anonymous, though it was notorious who was the author.

tions. And the sole point in attestation of which the two works just referred to were cited, was *the fact*, that the FORMER view *was* there maintained. And so far from concealing the circumstance, that those works spoke of bishops as the persons who were to ordain, I gave, among the *very* few extracts for which I could find room, one which *expressly stated it*, in the following words:—“as the Apostles themselves, in the beginning of the Church, did order priests and bishops, so *they appointed and willed the other BISHOPS after them to do the like.*” (p. 14.)

And I carefully *limited* the “parity of bishops and presbyters,” maintained in the works I quoted, to “the ministerial powers *essentially and by right* belonging to them,” in order not to include in it that “authority and jurisdiction in spiritual regiment,” as Archdeacon Mason calls it, in which bishops had “a higher degree” and “more excellent place.” (See my former Tract, p. 38.) There may be ministerial powers belonging to priests by right of their ordination, which, on grounds affecting the welfare of the Church, may have been from the first limited, in their “*use and exercise*” (as Dean Field says), to *some* of their number. And many divines, as I shall shew presently, have considered the power of conferring Orders to be one of such powers. So that the words I used were carefully selected, so as to *limit* the parity of bishops and presbyters, advocated in the works referred to; in such a way as not to include the *authority* confided to bishops in the matter of Ordination.

In the face of all this the Bishop has not been ashamed to represent me as concealing certain passages in these Works, which attribute the power of Ordination to bishops, in order to deceive the reader.

The character of the charge is apparent from what I have already stated, for I have actually given one such passage, though my object did not render it necessary for me to notice them. But the truth is, that the Bishop is, as we shall see more fully presently, utterly unacquainted with the subject on which he is here speaking. The fact that these works attribute the power of Ordination to bishops, does not touch my statement as to their teaching; nor indeed prove, that their authors would have denied the validity, under *all* circumstances, of Presbyterian Ordinations. The Bishop is evidently unconscious of what an assertion of the parity of order in bishops and priests means, and supposes that because the office of Ordaining is maintained to be confided to bishops, my position is overthrown, when in fact it is not touched; as I shall presently shew.

His Lordship scornfully observes, — “I dwell not on these strange omissions, because being anonymous [the article appeared in the “Christian Observer,” and the author was well known,] they are not very likely to mislead any prudent readers.” (p. 38.) For once I am happy to follow the Bishop’s example, and dwell not on these suicidal outbreaks of a misguided pen,—and, though *they* are *not* anonymous, for the same reason.

I now proceed to his Lordship’s criticism upon my remark, that “those who are at all acquainted with ecclesiastical history know, that this view had long been advocated by many of the divines of the Church of Rome, especially among the Scholastic divines, including their great founder, Peter Lombard, the Master of the Sentences.” (Doctrine, &c., p. 14.)

Of course I need not add a word to shew the truth of this remark. And as to its bearing upon the point in question, I was merely following the leading of some of our greatest divines in referring to this as *preparing the way*, to some extent, for the doctrine that Presbyterian Ordination might, under some circumstances, be valid. I need only instance Dean Field, Archdeacon Mason, and Bishop Cosin;* particularly the High Churchman Cosin, who goes *further than I have done*, and directly refers to the Master of the Sentences, and a number of the Scholastic divines, as holding views from which the validity of the Orders of “the Reformed French Churches” *necessarily follows*.

The remark however, though it must be a trite one with those who are familiar with the writings of our great divines, seems to have moved his Lordship’s choler in no ordinary degree. He believes that “no considerable school among them ever intended to give the slightest countenance to Ordination by any but bishops.” (p. 38.) Perhaps so; no more than they intended to give countenance to what happened at the Reformation by some of their statements that were nevertheless very useful to the Reformers. Moreover, when they spoke thus, they “were much influenced by their desire to exalt the Popedom,” in depressing bishops to the same order as priests. Well, perhaps they were. But what then? Why then, the angry but vapid conclusion is—“So much for the advocacy by many divines of the Church of Rome, of ‘the parity of bishops and presbyters,’” &c.—which does not seem very profound reasoning. And then as to Peter Lombard and the Scholastic divines, in whose

* See my former Tract, pp. 37—41; where, however, in my extracts from Field and Mason, I have not had room for their references to the Scholastic divines.

works his Lordship, wonderful to say, does “not pretend to be well read,” (which is in truth very evident,) I have most suspiciously abstained from giving “the slightest reference to any part of their works” in which the “HERETICAL *paradox*” (!) with which I charge them is to be found, and his Lordship has looked and cannot find it. And he may certainly look for ever, and not find his own misrepresentation of my statement, namely, that they advocate “*the validity of Presbyterian Ordination*, because they [*i. e.* bishops and presbyters] were accounted one order.” (p. 40.) But if he had only given a little attention to the statements of even those few of *our own* divines that I have just referred to, he would have saved himself the humiliation of such a remarkable display of ignorance on the whole matter as now follows; and which comes under the guise of a triumphant reply to my passing reference, on a subordinate point, to the Scholastic divines,—a reference supported by the testimony of such men as Bishop Cosin, and the others whom I have quoted.

His Lordship observes, that one great inducement with Peter Lombard and others to consider bishops and priests as “one order,” (and that they did so, he admits,) was their desire to magnify the Sacrament of the Eucharist, which is true enough; but then, adds the Bishop, as some ancient authors “accounted bishops a distinct order,” “a difficulty presented itself” to them, which “St. Thomas thus meets” (3^a. Sup. qu. 40, c. 5.) :—“Order may be taken in two ways—in one as it is a sacrament; and then, as has been said before, all order is ordained *ad Eucharistiæ Sacramentum*; wherefore, since the bishop has here no superior power to the priest’s, *quantum ad hoc*, Episcopate is not an Order. But Order may be considered in another way, that is, as it is a certain *office*, in respect to certain sacred acts; and so, as the bishop has a power in hierarchical acts, in respect to the mystical Body [the Church], superior to the priest, the Episcopate will be an Order: and it is in this way that Dionysius, and even the Master himself [iv. Dist. 24. s. i. m. iii.] speaks of it as an Order.”* (pp. 42, 43.)

Now, first, I did not say a word about “St. Thomas” in par-

* As I cannot suppose that the Bishop would not have given the *exact* words of this passage, if he had seen the original with his own eyes, he will permit me to advise him to tell the party who supplied him with this bit of information to be more accurate in his citations. The whole of the last clause, “and it is in this way,” &c., is a substitution of his for the words “et secundum hoc loquuntur auctoritates inductæ;” which were, no doubt, Dionysius and “Liber Sententiarum.” And so the words stand in the Commentary of Aquinas upon the “Liber Sententiarum,” from which the whole of this Supplement to his Summ. Theolog. was compiled.

ticular, but only referred to *some* of the Scholastic divines, as Dean Field and Bishop Cosin have done before me ; and therefore am not responsible for anything he has said. But the fact is, that, whatever may be the opinion of Thomas Aquinas or any of the rest about the validity, under some circumstances, of Presbyterian Ordination (which is a question I have not touched), *here is just the very species of language to which I referred as held by some of the Scholastic divines ; attributing the superiority of the Bishop, not to his having superior powers so far as his ORDERS were concerned, but only so far as concerned the OFFICE bestowed upon him ; that is, the official duties he had to perform.* So that the Bishop has quoted against me a passage precisely confirming my statement !

And then, if there is no greater difference between a presbyter and a bishop than this, may not a presbyter, under some circumstances, be authorized by his Church to perform those duties, and such acts be valid ? True enough, these very Scholastic divines might (though I do not think *all* did) maintain the negative of this : but that is nothing to the purpose ; and does not prove that, in laying down these views, they did not lay a *ground-work* for those who chose to maintain the affirmative. And it is amusing enough, that the Bishop, through his want of acquaintance with the subject, has just blundered upon the very passage of Aquinas which our learned Dean Field quotes as maintaining the very doctrine which the Bishop adduces it as opposing ; as will be seen in the extract I shall give almost immediately from the Dean's work "Of the Church."

And this passage of Aquinas serves also to answer the Bishop's argument from the words in the Preface to our Ordinal as to the "three orders of ministers." (See p. 22 above.)

Here, however, is his Lordship's exclamation, consequent upon his quotation,—“Such, and only such, is ‘the parity of bishops and priests as one Order’ in the Church of Rome on which our learned ultra-Protestant has built his triumphant argument in favour of Presbyterian Ordination—such the statement to which, by THUS ADOPTING THEM, HE HAS MADE HIS OWN:”—a sentence founded upon a blunder, and containing two palpable misstatements. For I have neither built my argument in favour of Presbyterian Ordination on such statements, nor adopted them ; but simply stated an undeniable fact as to the views maintained by some of the Scholastic divines, and the effect those views had in preparing the way for the doctrine of the validity of Presbyterian

Ordinations ; and the passage of Aquinas, on which the censure is founded, is itself a proof of the truth of my statement.

The Bishop tells me that my "self-devotion" to my theory "deserves a better fate than that which it is doomed to meet with." I am sorry that I cannot return the compliment. I hold that "self-devotion" to any theory, such as will induce a man to resort to every expedient to make out his case, deserves no "better fate" than his Lordship's special pleading is, he may rest assured, "doomed to meet with."

And after having charged me with "covering my own statement with *the authority of Rome*," as if in his anger he had forgotten all self-respect in the fabrication of his charges, he assures us that it is "absolutely useless;" nay, that "so far as Presbyterian Ordination is concerned," I have "actually raised up a very strong fresh barrier against my views;" for, wonderful to say, he has discovered that Peter Lombard and Thomas Aquinas tell us that to confer Holy Orders appertains to bishops only. The vulgar sarcasms that follow, about "penning statements in Evangelical Magazines," &c., I leave to their fate, only regretting that a Bishop should descend to language so unworthy of his position. I would however point out to the reader's notice the way in which Cranmer's name is here paraded by his Lordship (pp. 44, 45) as on his side of the question, in the face of facts as notorious as his existence, and which I have before referred to.*

Now, if all this had been put forth by a hot-headed youth fresh from college, one might have been contented with reminding him, that he ought to have made himself a little better acquainted with the subject before he spoke so positively about it. But when it proceeds from one whose *position* invests whatever comes from him with a certain degree of influence, and who has set himself up as the great Instructor of the Church,—insulting his Sovereign, reviling and excommunicating his Metropolitan, and hectoring over a large portion of the Church, because they do not adopt his views of orthodoxy,—one is bound to treat it in a different way, and very plainly point out to the world the utter incompetency of this self-constituted oracle for the office he would fain assume. And I must add, that the vaunts of superior theological learning made in behalf of a certain party among us are in odd contrast with the stubborn testimony of facts—facts dating from their first rise.

The correctness of my statement as to the views of some of the

* See "Doctrine of Church of England," &c., pp. 15, 16.

Scholastic divines, is shewn by the statement of the learned Morinus, in his work on Ordinations.

He says that there are four views among "Catholics" on this subject; and adds,—

"Prima et antiquis Scholasticis, eorumque Principibus communissima est, Episcopatum characterem non imprimere, non esse Ordinem seu Sacramentum a Sacerdotio distinctum, Episcopatum nihil illi addere ejusmodi; sed tantum per consecrationem aliquid sacramentale: quidquid Ordinis proprie dicti, qua ratione dicuntur septem Ordines; quidquid Sacramenti et characteris habet, illud a Sacerdotio quo necessario ante Episcopatum imbutus esse debet, haurire. Sed Episcopatum per se nihil aliud dicere quam officium, dignitatem, potestatem, auctoritatem *Sacerdoti DATAM* multò ampliorem et augustiorem, per consecrationem Episcopalem, ea quam per Sacerdotii characterem nactus fuerat." (De Ordin. Antw. 1695. Pt. 3. p. 26.)

And he remarks, — "*Hæc passim Scholasticorum Doctorum principes;*" referring to Hugo a S. Vict., Peter Lombard, Alexander Hal., Bonaventura, &c. &c., and *among the rest Thomas Aquinas, in the very passage which the Bishop has quoted from him.* And in the following chapter, shewing that this view was maintained by many of the Fathers, he notices the custom that prevailed for many years at Alexandria:—"Presbyteros Alexandrinos mortuo Episcopo suo unum ex Ordine et gremio Ecclesiæ suæ elegeris, thronoque excelsiori collocasse et Episcopum appellasse;" to whom of course, *when placed in that office, though without any fresh Ordination or Consecration*, the duty of Ordination belonged. And among other writers he cites the author of the "*Quæstiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti*," who lived before Augustine, who says,—"*Quid est enim Episcopus, nisi primus presbyter, hoc est summus sacerdos.... In Alexandria et per totam Ægyptum si desit Episcopus, consecrat Presbyter.*" (Ib. pp. 30, 31.)

Consequently, on this view of the matter, a presbyter needs no fresh Ordination to enable him to confer Orders. *His Ordination as presbyter is sufficient to enable him to fulfil all the duties of the ministerial office*, and the difference between a bishop and a presbyter is not as to "the ministerial powers, essentially and by right, belonging to them," but as to the *exercise* of those powers; which has been restrained to a certain extent in those presbyters who have not been appointed to the Episcopal office.

But the "*validity*" of Presbyterian Orders is a different question. And his Lordship's charge against me of citing the Scholastic divines as having maintained that doctrine, only shews his want of acquaintance with the subject. The solution of that question depends upon *the degree in which the restraint laid upon*

presbyters in the exercise of their powers is binding upon the whole Church. Many of the Scholastic divines who hold the view I have just noticed, would no doubt have maintained that that restraint was *jure divino*, and so *absolutely* binding. A few of them, however, maintain (as Morinus admits, p. 34,) that a bishop is above a presbyter only "*jure humano, non divino*:" and therefore though even *they* probably would have contended earnestly for the binding nature of this *ecclesiastical* arrangement, there was but a very short step from their doctrine to that of the validity, under many circumstances, of Presbyterian Ordination.

Before I pass on, it may be well to present to the reader the statement of our learned Dean Field, on the whole subject; including his account of the views of those Scholastic divines whom the Bishop charges me with misrepresenting. Not that I am disposed to attribute any great weight to the teaching of the Scholastic divines, and hence I made but a passing allusion to it in the Tract that has called forth the Bishop of Exeter's ire; but the Dean's statement will shew what degree of weight is due to his Lordship's account of the matter.

"The Apostles of Christ and their successors, when they planted the Churches, so divided the people of God converted by their ministry into particular Churches, that each city and the places near adjoining did make but one Church. Now because the unity and peace of each particular church of God and flock of his sheep dependeth on the unity of the pastor, and yet the necessities of the many duties that are to be performed in churches of so large extent require more Ecclesiastical ministers than one; therefore, though there be many presbyters, that is, many fatherly guides of one Church, yet there is *one amongst the rest* that is specially Pastor of the place, who, *for distinction sake, is named a Bishop*; to whom an eminent and peerless power is given, for the avoiding of schisms and factions; and the rest are but his assistants and coadjutors, and named by the general name of presbyters. So that in the performance of the acts of Ecclesiastical ministry, when he is present, and will do them himself, they must give place; and in his absence, or when being present he needeth assistance, they may do nothing without his consent and liking. Yea, so far *for order's sake* is he preferred above the rest, that some things are specially reserved to him only, *as the ordaining of such as should assist him in the work of his ministry*, the reconciling of penitents, confirmation of such as were baptized, by imposition of hands, dedication of churches, and such like. These being the diverse sorts and kinds of Ecclesiastical power, it will easily appear to all them that enter into the due consideration thereof, that the power of ecclesiastical or sacred order, that is, the power and authority to intermeddle with things pertaining to the service of God, and to perform eminent acts of gracious efficacy, tending to the procuring of the eternal good of the sons of men, is *equal and the same in all those whom we call presbyters, that is, fatherly guides of God's Church and people*: and that, *ONLY FOR ORDER'S SAKE, and the preservation of peace, there is a limitation*

of the use and exercise of the same. HEREUNTO AGREE ALL THE BEST LEARNED AMONGST THE ROMANISTS THEMSELVES, FREELY CONFESSING THAT THAT WHEREIN A BISHOP EXCELLETH A PRESBYTER, IS NOT A DISTINCT AND HIGHER ORDER, OR POWER OF ORDER, BUT A KIND OF DIGNITY AND OFFICE OR EMPLOYMENT ONLY.* Which they prove, because a presbyter ordained *per saltum*, that never was consecrated or ordained deacon, may notwithstanding do all those acts that pertain to the deacon's order (because the higher order doth always imply in it the lower and inferior in an eminent and excellent sort): but a bishop ordained *per saltum*, that never had the ordination of a presbyter, can neither consecrate and administer the Sacrament of the Lord's body, nor ordain a presbyter, himself being none, nor do any act peculiarly pertaining to presbyters. Whereby it is most evident, that that wherein a bishop excelleth a presbyter, is not a distinct power of order, but an eminency and dignity only, *specially yielded to one above all the rest of the same rank, for order sake, and to preserve the unity and peace of the Church*. Hence it followeth, that many things which, in some cases, presbyters may lawfully do, are peculiarly reserved unto bishops, as Hierome noteth (*Contra Luciferianos*), *Potius ad honorem sacerdotii, quam ad legis necessitatem; rather for the honour of their ministry than the necessity of any law*. And therefore we read (Greg. Januario Ep. l. 3. indict. 12. epist. 26.) that presbyters in some places, and at some times, did impose hands, and confirm such as were baptized; which when Gregory bishop of Rome would wholly have forbidden, there was so great exception taken to him for it, that he left it free again. And who knoweth not, that all presbyters in cases of necessity may absolve and reconcile penitents (Carth. 3. can. 32.); a thing in ordinary course appropriated unto bishops? and why not by the same reason ordain presbyters and deacons in cases of like necessity? For seeing the cause why they are forbidden to do these acts, is, because to bishops ordinarily the care of all churches is committed, and to them in all reason the ordination of such as must serve in the Church pertaineth, that have the chief care of the Church, and have churches wherein to employ them; which only bishops have as long as they retain their standing; and not presbyters, being but assistants to bishops in their churches: if they become enemies to God and true religion, in case of such necessity, as the care and government of the Church is devolved to the presbyters remaining Catholic, and being of a better spirit; so the duty of ordaining such as are to assist or succeed them in the work of the ministry pertains to them likewise. For if the power of order, and authority to intermeddle in things pertaining to God's service, be the same in all presbyters, and that they be limited in the execution of it, only for order sake, so that in case of necessity every of them may baptize, and confirm them whom they have baptized, absolve and reconcile penitents, and do all those other acts which regularly are appropriated unto the bishop alone; there is no reason to be given, but that in case of necessity, wherein all bishops were extinguished by death, or *being fallen into heresy, should refuse to ordain any to serve God in his true worship*; but that presbyters, as they may do all other acts, whatsoever special challenge bishops in

* To this sentence he attaches the following references; the first being, as the reader will observe, *the very passage in Thomas Aquinas cited by the Bishop for a contrary purpose*:—Thomas, 3. p. in addit. quæst. 40. art. 5. Bonaven. l. 4. dist. 24. ar. 2. q. 3. Dominicus a Soto, l. 10. de justitia et jure, q. 1. art. 2. and in 4. dist. 24. q. 2. art. 3. Armacanus, l. 11. ostendit nullum prælatum plus habere de potestate sacramentali sive ordinis, quam simplices sacerdotes. Cameracensis in 4. quæst. 4. Contarenus de Sacramentis, lib. 4.

ordinary course make unto them, might do this also. *Who then dare condemn all those worthy ministers of God, that were ordained by presbyters in sundry churches of the world, at such times as bishops in those parts where they lived opposed themselves against the truth of God, and persecuted such as professed it ?*"

And he then adds some references to shew that even in the Church of Rome Ordinations of this nature have been held by some to be valid; but into this question it is unnecessary to enter. And as it respects the early Church, he remarks,—

"All that may be alleged out of the Fathers, for proof of the contrary, may be reduced to two heads. For first, whereas they make all such ordinations void, as are made by presbyters, it is to be understood according to the strictness of the *Canons in use in their time, and not absolutely in the nature of the thing*; which appears, in that they likewise make all ordinations *sine titulo* to be void: all ordinations of bishops ordained by fewer than three bishops with the metropolitan: all ordinations of presbyters by bishops out of their own churches without special leave: whereas I am well assured, the Romanists will not pronounce any of these to be void, though the parties so doing are not excusable from all fault. Secondly, their sayings are to be understood regularly, not without exception of some special cases that may fall out."*

In a subsequent part of his work he reverts to the same subject, and adds the following remarks:—

"Touching the preeminence of bishops above presbyters, there is some difference among the School-divines. For the best learned amongst them are of opinion, that bishops are not greater than presbyters in the power of consecration or order: but only in the exercise of it, and in the power of jurisdiction, seeing presbyters may preach, and minister the greatest of all sacraments, by virtue of their consecration and order, as well as bishops. Touching the power of consecration or order, saith Durandus (in 4 Sent. dist. 24. q. 5.), it is much doubted of among divines, whether any be greater therein than an ordinary presbyter: for Hierome seemeth to have been of opinion, that the highest power of consecration or order is the power of a priest or elder; so that every priest in respect of his priestly power may minister all sacraments, confirm the baptized, *give all Orders*, all blessings and consecrations; but that for the avoiding of the peril of schism, it was ordained that one should be chosen, who should be named a bishop, to whom the rest should obey, and to whom it was reserved to give Orders, and to do some such other things as none but bishops do. And afterwards he saith, that Hierome is clearly of this opinion; not making the distinction of bishops from presbyters a mere human invention, or a thing not necessary, as *Aerius* did; but thinking that amongst them who are equal in the power of order, and equally enabled to do any sacred act, the Apostles (for the avoiding of schism and confusion, and the preservation of unity, peace, and order) ordained that in each church one should be before and above the rest, without whom the rest should do nothing, and to whom some things should be peculiarly reserved, as the

* Of the Church, bk. 3. c. 39. 2nd ed. 1628. pp. 156—158.

dedicating of churches, reconciling of penitents, confirming of the baptized, and the ordination of such as are to serve in the work of the ministry : of which the three former were reserved to the bishop alone, *potius ad honorem Sacerdotii, quam ad legis necessitatem* ; that is, rather to honour his priestly and bishoply place, than for that those things at all may not be done by any other. And therefore we read, (Ambros. in 4 ad Ephes.) that at some times, and in some cases of necessity, presbyters did reconcile penitents, and by imposition of hands confirm the baptized. But the ordaining of men to serve in the work of the ministry is more properly reserved to them. For seeing none are to be ordained at random, but to serve in some church, and none have churches but bishops, all other being but assistants to them in their churches, none may ordain but they only, unless it be in cases of extreme necessity, as when all bishops are extinguished by death, or, fallen into heresy, obstinately refuse to ordain men to preach the Gospel of Christ sincerely. And then as the care and charge of the Church is devolved to the presbyters remaining Catholic, so likewise the ordaining of men to assist them and succeed them in the work of the ministry. But hereof I have spoken at large elsewhere. Wherefore to conclude this point, we see that the best learned amongst the Schoolmen are of opinion, that *bishops are no greater than presbyters in the power of consecration or order, but only in the exercise of it*, and in the power of jurisdiction, with whom Stapleton (Relect. Contro. 2. q. 3. art. 3.) seemeth to agree, saying expressly that, *Quoad ordinem sacerdotalem, et ea quæ sunt ordinis*, that is, *in respect of sacerdotal order, and the things that pertain to order*, they are EQUAL ; and that therefore in all administration of sacraments which depend of order, they are all equal *POTESTATE*, though not *EXERCITIO* ; that is, in power, though not in the execution of things to be done by virtue of that power. Whence it will follow, that ordination, being a kind of sacrament, and so depending of the power of order, in the judgment of our adversaries might be ministered by presbyters, but that for the avoiding of such horrible confusions, scandals, and schisms, as would follow upon such promiscuous ordinations, they are restrained by the decree of the Apostles ; and none permitted to do any such thing, except it be in case of extreme necessity, but bishops, who *have the power of order in common together with presbyters*, but yet so, as that they excel them *in the execution of things to be done by virtue of that power*, and in the power of jurisdiction also."

And he then proceeds to animadvert upon Bellarmine's opposite view on the subject. (Ib. bk. 5. c. 27. pp. 500, 501.)

I have given these passages *in extenso*, because they will serve to shew the reader the grounds upon which the validity of Presbyterian Ordinations is rested in one of the standard works of our Church. And with them he may compare the recent effusions with which our Church has been favoured on the same subject.

And I must add, that if I had been anxious to dwell upon this argument, derived from ante-Reformation authorities, for the parity of order of bishops and presbyters, I might have added several others of a more stringent kind.

I might have pointed to early canons of our own Church recognising this doctrine ; as for instance, to one in the Canons of

Eggbright, archbishop of York, in 750, Can. 27., "That the bishop in the church sit elevated above the Bench of Presbyters, but in the House let him know himself to be a colleague of the presbyters." (Wilk. Concil. vol. i. p. 103.) And again, to the 17th of Elfric's Canons, in 970,—*"There is no more difference between a bishop and a presbyter, than that the bishop is appointed to ordain presbyters, and to confirm children, and to hallow churches, and to take care of God's rights: since it would be too much, if every presbyter might do this: FOR THEY HAVE THE SAME ORDER, BUT THE OTHER IS MORE HONOURABLE."* (Ib. p. 252.)

And above all, I might have referred to an authority which I am sure his Lordship would have received with the most profound respect. Indeed I am astonished beyond measure that his Lordship should venture for a moment to question the truth of the doctrine in the face of the authority I am about to mention. Has his Lordship already forgotten the fourth Council of Carthage?—a Council of which he recently informed his Metropolitan, that he "need not remind" him, that it was "received generally, and one whose canons were adopted by the General Council of Chalcedon," and is "thus seen to have had *the authority of the whole Catholic Church*?"* His Lordship, therefore, (to use his own language to his Metropolitan,) "will not consider it irrelevant, if I present" him with the 35th Canon of this Council, which runs thus,—*"Ut Episcopus in Ecclesia et in consessu presbyterorum sublimior sedeat. Intra domum vero collegam se presbyterorum esse cognoscat."* (Concil. ed. Hardouin. tom. 1. col. 981.) So that, according to his Lordship's own shewing, my "*heretical paradox*" has "*the authority of the whole Catholic Church*" of primitive times in its favour. I need not indeed inform him of my own opinion of the authority of this Council, which remains perfectly unaltered by anything which his Lordship's defenders have urged against my remarks upon it; and which certainly is not likely to be changed by the very amusing blunder of his favoured advocate Mr. Watson, who actually confounds the Canons of this fourth Council of Carthage with what is called the Code of the African Church; a specimen of the remainder of his pamphlet; which I leave to the fate the public have already assigned to it. I can assure his Lordship, therefore, that *by me* he will not be condemned for rebellion against the doctrine of "*the whole Catholic Church*" for not accepting its canons; but his Lordship's *self-condemnation* must be complete.

* Letter to Archbishop of Canterbury, p. 15.

I now go on with my task.

The Bishop next proceeds to deal with the argument derived from the writings and conduct of our divines. And here his Lordship's attempt at evidence of this kind in his favour almost amounts to a confession of failure. With the exception of Cranmer, whose views were notoriously opposed to his doctrine, he quotes none for the reign of Edward VI. He mentions indeed the *name* of Ridley (p. 44), but makes no reference to any part of his writings; and therefore, in reply to this vague claim, I shall merely refer the reader to Ridley's Letter to Grindal, then at Frankfort, in which he speaks of his prayers to God "for all *those Churches abroad* through the world, which have forsaken the kingdom of Antichrist, and professed openly *the purity* of the Gospel of Jesus Christ:" (Works, p. 393.) in which his recognition of those Churches is, I suppose, sufficiently manifest.

And as to other testimonies of this period, they exist in abundance. Thus Archdeacon Philpot, the martyr, says,—

"I allow the Church of Geneva, and the doctrine of the same; for it is *una, catholica, et apostolica*, and doth follow the doctrine that the Apostles did preach; and the doctrine taught and preached in King Edward's days was also according to the same." (Works, p. 153.)

Thus also we find Bishop Hooper, and Drs. Cox and Aylmer, both afterwards bishops, addressing the ministers of the Foreign Reformed Churches as dear brethren and ministers of the Church of Christ;* and this before any of our Reformers were indebted to them for an asylum in time of persecution; a circumstance which the Bishop somewhat unfairly adduces as rendering invalid a similar testimony from the divines of Elizabeth's reign.

Many other similar testimonies abound.

On proceeding to the reign of Elizabeth, the Bishop finds himself, in the early part of that reign, in a state of things so entirely opposed to his views, that he is obliged to shut up all argument in some general remarks as to the gratitude of our Reformers towards the foreign Calvinists for the asylum afforded them in the reign of Mary, producing "a great laxity of practice in our Church" "in the Article of Orders." (p. 45.) "In short," he observes, after noticing a few cases of this kind, "sympathy with the foreign Calvinists, whom so many of the bishops and higher dignitaries in the age of Elizabeth at once loved as their benefactors and

* See Letters relative to Engl. Reform. Parker Soc. ed. vol. i. pp. 33 et s., 119 et s., 275 et s.

reverenced as their teachers, continued to influence both *doctrine* and *practice* in the English Church *during that whole generation.*" (p. 46.) And these are the very men, let us observe, by whom our Formularies—the Articles as they now stand, and the Prayer Book except a few alterations not affecting the doctrine in question—were drawn up. And the only two persons whom the Bishop has ventured to claim as witnessing in his favour, during the whole of Queen Elizabeth's reign, are Hooker and Bishop Bilson.

How far the former of these is a supporter of his Lordship's views, may be judged from the passages I have formerly quoted from him on this subject.* But let us see how the Bishop endeavours to make good his ground in claiming his support. He first criticizes and condemns Hooker's doctrine, "that the whole Church visible is the true original subject of all power;" and also the remark which flows from it, namely, that by the imposition of the bishop's hands "the Church giveth power of Order both unto presbyters and deacons;" which the Bishop sees to be clearly opposed to his statement as to what is required for lawful ordination. On this I offer no remark, as it is not any part of my task to defend Hooker against the Bishop of Exeter. But he proceeds to fix upon a remark of Hooker, that ordinations must ordinarily be by bishops, except in the case of an extraordinary commission by God, or "when *the exigence of necessity* doth constrain to leave the usual ways of the Church—when the Church must needs have some ordained, and neither hath nor can have possibly a bishop to ordain." (pp. 46, 47.) And he argues, that, as this *necessity* cannot now be pleaded for the Foreign Reformed Churches, "Hooker must be cited as a very strong authority against the Orders of the Foreign Protestants, whose case we are considering." (p. 49.)

Now on this argument from "necessity" I have already offered some remarks,† and shewn that the term, as used by our early divines in this matter, was not intended to denote such a necessity as the Bishop here supposes, that is, that there should be no bishops in the world who would give them ordination, but only one arising from a failure of orthodox bishops in the Church in which such ordinations took place. But in truth the Bishop himself has saved me all further trouble by refuting himself; for he has been at pains to shew, that in Hooker's

* See Doctr. of Ch. of Engl. on Non-Ep. Ord. pp. 20, 21.

† Reply to Archdeacon Churton and Chancellor Harington, p. 26.

own time the Foreign Protestant Churches might easily have obtained Episcopal Orders. (p. 49.) Consequently, as they did not do so, and yet nevertheless Hooker held* that their Orders (instancing in *Beza's*, which had less in their favour than some others) were valid, he “must be cited as a very strong authority,” to use the Bishop’s own words, *in favour of the Orders of the Foreign Protestants*, whose case we are considering.

The reply to the extracts from Bishop Bilson is, that he is speaking of the ordinary state of things, in which, as established by the custom of the Church, bishops only might ordain. But that he did not mean to tie the Church to bishops, is evident from what he says in another work; that,—“To bishops speaking the word of God, princes as well as others must yield obedience; but if bishops pass their commission and speak besides the word of God, what they list, both prince and people may despise them.”†

To the extracts from Hooker and Bishop Bilson, the only other testimonies which his Lordship has added in favour of his views, from the Reformation to the present day, are two from Bishops Sanderson and Pearson.

To set before the reader the views of the former, he quotes a passage in which the following sentence occurs:—“A man might therefore justly wonder how it should come to pass that the Episcopal power, in *that which is peculiar to bishops above other their brethren in the ministry, viz., the ordaining of priests and deacons*, and the managing of the keys, cannot be said to be of God, but it must be forthwith condemned to be highly derogatory to the regal power,” &c. (p. 51.) And then, adds the Bishop of Exeter, “having stated various ways in which *divino jure* may be understood, he thus gives his own view, in a Postscript:—‘My opinion is, that Episcopal government is not to be derived merely from Apostolic practice or institution; but that it is originally founded in the Person and Office of the Messiah our Lord Jesus Christ, who, being sent by His Heavenly Father to be the great Apostle, Bishop, and Pastor of His Church, &c. . . . did afterwards, before His ascension into Heaven, send and empower His holy Apostles, giving them the Holy Ghost, as His Father had before sent Him to execute the same Apostolical, Episcopal, and Pastoral office for the ordering and governing of His Church even unto the end of

* Eccl. Pol. vii. 14.

† True Difference between Christian Subjection and Unchristian Rebellion. Oxf. 1585. 4to. p. 261, 262.

the world. This I take to be so clear from those and other texts,' &c." (pp. 51, 52.)

And hence his Lordship draws the conclusion, that Bishop Sanderson "*thus asserted the exclusive power of bishops to ordain divino jure.*" (p. 52.)

Now if the Bishop of Exeter had been put on his trial for holding such a doctrine as is here maintained, it would have been quite fair for him to have referred to these words of Bishop Sanderson in his defence. But when he is arraigning his Metropolitan and others for error and heresy because they do not take such a view, it is anything but fair to refer to Sanderson as he has done.

For, in the first place, Bishop Sanderson points out two different senses of the phrase *jus divinum*, observing,—

"Sometimes it importeth a *Divine precept* (which is indeed the primary and most proper signification) when it appeareth by some clear express and peremptory command of God in his Word, to be the will of God that the thing so commanded should be perpetually and universally observed. Of which sort, setting aside the Articles of the Creed, and the moral duties of the law (which are not much pertinent to the present inquiry), there are, as I take it, very few things that can be said to be of *Divine positive right* under the New Testament. *The preaching of the Gospel and administration of the Sacraments, are two: which when I have named, I think I have named all.* But there is a secondary and more extended signification of that term, which is also of frequent use among divines. In which sense such things as, having no express command in the Word, yet are found to have authority and warrant from the institution, example, and approbation either of Christ himself or his Apostles; and have (in regard of the importance and usefulness of the things themselves) been held, by the consentient judgment of all the Churches of Christ in the primitive and succeeding ages, needful to be continued: such things I say are (though not so properly as the former, yet) usually and *interpretative* said to be of *Divine right*. Of which sort I take the observation of the Lord's day, the ordering the keys, the distinction of presbyters and deacons, and some other things (not all perhaps of equal consequence) to be. Unto *Jus Divinum* in that former acception, is required a Divine precept: in this latter, it sufficeth thereunto that a thing be of Apostolical institution or practice. Which ambiguity is the more to be heeded, for that the observation thereof is of great use for the avoiding of sundry mistakes, that through the ignorance or neglect thereof daily happen to the engaging of men in endless disputes, and entangling their consciences in unnecessary scruples."

And having thus pointed out these two senses of the term *Jus Divinum*, he proceeds to shew in what manner the phrase is to be applied in the matter of Episcopacy. And he says,—

"Now that the government of the Churches of Christ by bishops is of Divine right in that first and stricter sense, is an opinion at least of *great PROBABILITY*, and such as may more easily and upon better grounds be

defended *than confuted*. . . . Yet because it is both inexpedient to maintain a dispute where it needs not, and needless to contend for more, where less will serve the turn; I find that our divines that have travailed most in this argument, where they purposely treat of it, do rather choose to stand to the tenure of Episcopacy *ex Apostolica designatione*, than to hold a contest upon the title of *Jus Divinum*, no necessity requiring the same to be done. They therefore that so speak of this government as established by Divine right, are not all of them necessarily so to be understood, as if they meant it in that first and stricter sense. Sufficient it is for the justification of the Church of England in the constitution and government thereof, that it is (as certainly it is) of Divine right in the latter and larger signification: that is to say, of Apostolical institution and approbation; exercised by the Apostles themselves, and by other persons in their times, appointed and enabled thereunto by them, according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by virtue of the commission they had received from him."

So that all he ventures to say in favour of Episcopacy being *jure divino* in the strict sense of the phrase—which alone would make it of absolute necessity—is that it appears to him to be "an *opinion* at least of great PROBABILITY;" and he admits, that our divines for the most part only contend for the *apostolical* institution of Episcopacy.

He then remarks, that this latter view is "a part of the established doctrine of the Church of England," (in which I entirely agree with him,) and that it "hath been constantly and uniformly maintained by our best writers, and by all the sober, orderly, and orthodox sons of this Church." (Episcop. not prejud. to Reg. Power, Lond. 1673. Sect. II. §§ 3—6.)

The latter is a somewhat large assertion, but no doubt true of a great majority of such divines. But then, as I have already abundantly shewn,* those among them who held this view maintained *also* the validity under some circumstances of Presbyterian Ordinations.

And now, with respect to the passage quoted by the Bishop of Exeter from the "Postscript" to this work, I shall merely take the liberty of giving the reader the previous context. Bishop Sanderson says,—

"Whereas in my answer to the former of the two objections in the foregoing Treatise, I have not anywhere made any clear discovery what my own particular judgment is concerning the *Jus Divinum* of Episcopacy in the stricter sense, either in the affirmative or negative: and for want of so doing, may perhaps be censured by some to have walked but haltingly, or at leastwise with more caution and mincing than became me to do in a business of that nature; I do hereby declare,—1. That to avoid the starting of more questions

* See the authorities quoted in my former Tract, "The Doctrine of the Church of England on Non-Episcopal Ordinations."

than needs must, I then thought it fitter (and am of the same opinion still) to *decline that question, than to determine it either way*: such determination being clearly of no moment at all to my purpose, and for the solving of that objection. 2. That nevertheless (LEAVING OTHER MEN TO THE LIBERTY OF THEIR OWN JUDGMENTS) my opinion is, that Episcopal government is," &c. (as follows in the Bishop of Exeter's extract.)

Now if the Bishop of Exeter will follow Bishop Sanderson's course in "*leaving other men to the liberty of their own judgments*," and not denounce as heretics and unfaithful to the doctrine of their Church, those who take the lower of the two views mentioned by Sanderson, I for one will leave him to follow Sanderson, without molestation, in taking the higher view. But let him not think to avail himself of the authority of Sanderson in his assault upon his Metropolitan and seven tenths at least of the clergy, by quoting scraps from him which only shew *half* his mind.

And I must add, with respect to Bishop Sanderson's own doctrine, that it does not seem to have prevented his recognising the Foreign Non-Episcopal Churches as true Churches of Christ, and therefore their ministers as true ministers of Christ. For in his brief "Discourse concerning the Church," he has a chapter entitled, "Concerning Protestant Churches;" and he defines them as "those visible particular churches, which having by an external separation freed themselves from the tyranny and idolatry of Popery, have more or less reformed the doctrine and worship from Popish corruptions, and restored them more or less to the ancient and primitive purity;" and he adds as instances,—"*The Church of England, the Church of Denmark, the Church of Saxony*," &c. (Disc. conc. the Church. Lond. 1688. 4to. pp. 19, 20.)

Whatever, therefore, might be Bishop Sanderson's view, he certainly found some way of reconciling it with the notion that the Foreign Non-Episcopal Churches were true Churches of Christ, and therefore their ministers true ministers of Christ.

The Bishop next claims the authority of Pearson in his favour. And he quotes first from some "Theological Determinations,"* designed to be part of a work entitled, "*Summa Theologiæ ex Sententia Doctoris in Ecclesia Anglicana tradita*;" and which, the Bishop tells us, "*is, therefore, his deliberate expression of what he deemed the doctrine of our Church on the subjects treated therein.*" I must submit that the words of the title are by no means so *exclusive*, and imply no more than doctrine which may be lawfully main-

* Minor Theological Works of Bishop Pearson. Oxf. 1844. vol. i. p. 271 et seq.

tained in the Church of England. These "Determinations" are in number three, and entitled: "I. Ordo Episcopalis est Apostolicus. II. Ordinandi potestas solis competit Episcopis. III. Ordinatio Anglicana complet totam Essentiam externæ Vocationis ad Ministerium."

Now it is quite possible, that Pearson, like Sanderson, may have taken the highest view of the *Jus Divinum* of Episcopacy; and I am not concerned to disprove it; but I hardly think that the "Determinations" to which the Bishop here refers us will prove it. And for this reason; that they lay down *the general rule*, and do not touch the question, whether there are or are not any *exceptional cases*. And we may find quite as strong passages as occur in these "Determinations" in authors who nevertheless, in other parts of their writings, have distinctly admitted the validity, under some circumstances, of Presbyterian Ordinations; as for instance, Archdeacon Mason.

The Bishop's remaining citation is from a Letter of Bishop Pearson against the allowance of "promiscuous Ordinations" in the Church of England.* The matter therefore against which the Letter is directed, is very different from that now under discussion. For it would no doubt be very undesirable to allow such Ordinations in *one and the same* Church, while yet Non-Episcopal Ordinations might be valid in other Churches.

But his Lordship will say, Read what he says. Let us do so; and first let us take his Lordship's citation, which is this:—

"That the order of the ministry is necessary to the continuation of the Gospel according to the promises of Christ, as it was to the first plantation of it according to His institution, is a doctrine indubitable. That this ministry is derived by a succession and constant propagation, and that the unity and peace of the Church of Christ are to be conserved by a due and legitimate ordination, no man who considereth the practice of the Apostles and Ecclesiastical history can ever doubt." "However, in the peculiar and happy condition of our Church, these promiscuous ordinations, if at all allowed by it, are most destructive to that which is the safety and honour of it. We have the greatest felicity which could happen to a Reformation, as being regular and authoritative," &c. &c.—the Bishop extending his quotation much further.

But here I paused in reading, for it was impossible not to see, that something was *omitted* where the inverted commas indicated a break in the quotation, very germane to the question under discussion. It was tolerably clear, by the words, "*However*, in the peculiar

* Minor Theological Works, vol. ii. p. 231.

and happy condition of *our Church*," &c., that some concession had been made respecting Churches *not* in so "peculiar and happy a condition." And accordingly I found there the following passage:—

"This way of Ordination, having continued so many ages one and the same, could never be considerably altered without some great commotions and dissensions in the Church, and the manifest breach of union and communion in that body; *whomsoever we judge guilty of the breach of that union; which is not necessary now to dispute.* And as the first introduction of *different ordinations* caused a standing and settled opposition, precluding all ways of reconciliation; so they cannot be brought into any *one Church*, but they must make such a division and disparity in the administrations, as will amount to no less than a schism." And then follows the remark contrasting with what is here alluded to, the "peculiar and happy condition of *our Church*," and the "felicity" of *our Reformation* "as being regular and authoritative."

Now this allusion to the Foreign Protestant Churches is not that of one who entirely disowns them as Churches, but rather of one who considered it as their misfortune that their reformation was not regular, and held that the guilt of the consequent "breach of union and communion" might not rest with them. This remark, which is the only one in the whole Letter directly affecting the point in question, the Bishop has *omitted* in his extracts, though he has cited almost the whole of the rest of the Letter.

His Lordship adds, that he has cited these testimonies as occurring, "not in *obiter dicta*, but in works written on the very subject of Orders," and consequently worth more than "a whole Catena of writers, however eminent, who are treating the matter either incidentally and *aliud agentes*, or under collateral influences, such as a desire to make out as good a case as they can for Foreign Protestants among whom they were living;" and he adds, "This last remark specially applies to the strongest testimony on that side with which I am acquainted, Dr. Cosins's [Cosin's] letter to Mr. Cordel at Blois, dated Paris, Feb. 7, 1650." (p. 56.)

But, in the first place, this is no reply to such testimonies as have been brought from Saravia, from Archbishop Whitgift, from Dean Field, from Archdeacon Mason. And secondly, whatever truth there is in the general proposition, that a testimony derived from a work written expressly on the subject is of more value than an *obiter dictum* respecting it in a work on a different subject, this observation does not apply to the case in hand; for what we want

to know is the opinion of our divines, *not on the general question* of the Scriptural and Apostolical form of government for the Church, but *on certain exceptional cases*, and whether under some circumstances that form of government may not be lawfully departed from. And we see in the case of Archdeacon Mason, that a work may be published *on the general subject*, from which the views of the author on *exceptional cases* cannot be judged, but, on the contrary, greatly misapprehended.*

The attempt to get rid of the testimony of Bishop Cosin, given in his able and elaborate letter *written expressly on the point under discussion*, is, of course, not worth one word in the way of refutation. It simply shews the utterly impervious character of the mind that indited it to anything that it does not wish to receive.

What follows is still more extraordinary. For the Bishop adds:—

“Yet even he refers the question [*i. e.* of “communicating with them of the French Church”] ultimately to the decision of our own Church; which decision, solemnly given by Convocation in 1661, and afterwards confirmed by the Act of Uniformity, was, we know, against the concession here made; yet it had the full assent, concurrence, and earnest co-operation of Cosins [Cosin] † himself.” (p. 56.)

Now, with all due respect, I beg to say, first, that Dr. Cosin did not refer the question to the decision of our own Church, for he merely stated his “protestation” “not to recede in anywise from the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England,” which renders his testimony all the stronger; and he added, that there was “no prohibition of our Church against it:” and secondly, as the reader probably well knows, there was *no subsequent decision* of Convocation in 1661, or of the Act of Uniformity, “against the concession here made.” And I suspect his Lordship himself would be very sorry to be prosecutor in a suit against one who had chosen, when abroad, to communicate with the Non-Episcopal Churches of the Continent.

And thus, when we contrast the real value of his Lordship’s statements with the magisterial and imperious tone in which they are delivered, we seek in vain for any justification of his Lordship’s high pretensions.

So ends the Bishop’s attempt to support his doctrine from the

* See “Doctrine,” &c., p. 38; and “Reply to Churton and Harington,” p. 31.

† It is somewhat remarkable that the very name of this learned Bishop seeks unknown to his Lordship.

writings of our divines. And whatever may be the opinion of the reader as to the views of his Lordship's referees, I must again remind him, that I do not pretend to shew, that none of our divines ever held the doctrine of the exclusive lawfulness of Episcopal Ordination. This I am not concerned to prove, and do not profess to do so. And if the Bishop likes to maintain such a view without arraigning as heretics and unfaithful sons of our Church those who hold a contrary opinion, let him do so. Our Church has not *forbidden* the view, though she clearly has not sanctioned it in her Formularies; and her 23d Article *implies* a contrary doctrine.

But when the Bishop takes the ground he does, he is bound to shew, when treating of the testimonies of our divines on the subject, that there is *not* that testimony in favour of the *opposite* view in their writings that raises a good argument for it from that source. And therefore what he had more especially to do was, not to adduce two or three supposed testimonies in favour of *his own* view from those writings; but to shew that the host of testimonies cited for the opposite view were incorrectly cited, and that there was in fact no weighty evidence of that kind to be adduced in its behalf. But, instead of this, he has passed them by, with the exception of Hooker and Cosin, in profound silence; though they were brought under his eye in the very Tract he here criticizes. And very remarkable it is, that while his Lordship has thought it worth while to spend several pages upon my few remarks on the Formularies of the time of Henry VIII. and the Scholastic divines,—which were introduced as but indirectly bearing on the real question at issue,—he has passed over without the slightest notice all but two of the direct testimonies I have cited, shewing both the doctrine and practice of the greatest divines of our Church from the Reformation to the present day.

Before I conclude, I shall call the reader's attention to a brief recapitulation of the authorities which the Bishop has thus passed by. But, previous to doing so, there is one more point to be noticed in the Bishop's Letter. His Lordship has, with much reason, conceived it necessary to offer some remarks, before he closed his argument, on the 55th Canon; which had, of course, been quoted as entirely opposed to the doctrine he is attempting to establish. That Canon, passed in 160 $\frac{3}{4}$, orders the clergy to pray for "the Church of Scotland;" while it is an *undeniable fact*, that the Church of Scotland had then no bishops, in the proper sense of the word,

and therefore of course none but Presbyterian Orders at the best. The consequence is obvious, namely, that our Church did not then consider Episcopal Orders necessary under all circumstances to constitute a valid ministry.

The particulars of the case of the Church of Scotland at this period I have so fully stated in a recent publication,* that I do not here repeat them.

To the overthrow of this obvious and necessary conclusion, his Lordship has devoted six pages. With what success may easily be foreseen.

He commences with the following very remarkable observation :—

“What was the exact position of the *Presbyterian* government in Scotland according to law in 1603, I confess myself *unable to ascertain without more of labour than the point itself would seem to be worth*. The ecclesiastical history of that country at that period is so full of intricacy as to *baffle ordinary research*. I think it very likely that the English Convocation in 1603 was itself *scarcely better informed on this point than we are*,” &c. (p. 57.)

With this amount of information on the subject, his Lordship thinks himself justified in dogmatically determining,—after quoting some passionate exclamations of James I. against Presbyterianism, and such-like fruitless evidence,—that the notion that the Kirk of Scotland, as it then existed, (and which was the only visible Church of Scotland in existence,) “should be ‘the very Church of Scotland’ designated by the Canon as the object of our prayers, is too gross for an ordinary understanding to digest.” (p. 58.)

Whether this mode of settling the matter by one who confesses his ignorance of the data upon which any sound conclusion must be grounded, will be satisfactory to his Lordship’s adherents, I know not. But certainly with any others it must be utterly worthless.

The Bishop perhaps thinks so himself, for he adds some arguments on the subject ; and the first is this :—

“That the Church which is really intended in the Canon,” says the Bishop, “*must be in communion with that which thus recognises it in her prayers to be a Church*, I need not say.” (pp. 58, 59.)

So that the Church of England, according to the Bishop, recognises no Christian community to be a Church but those that are in communion with her ! When, therefore, we pray for the Catholic Church, we mean the Church of England and that portion of the Christian world that is in communion with her !

* Reply to Archdeacon Churton and Chancellor Harington.

And then follows another still more remarkable specimen of his Lordship's mode of reasoning, addressed to the "soberer portion" of those who differ from him in this matter. His Lordship commences with a formal proof that the "realm of Scotland" is included in the terms used in the 1st, 36th, and 55th Canons to describe the countries over which King James ruled, which might have been readily granted. But in those Canons the king is described (to quote the words of the last) as "supreme governor in these his realms, over all persons, in all causes ecclesiastical as well as temporal." Now for the consequence. "*Therefore,*" writes his Lordship, "Mr. Macaulay, and all who may have availed themselves of the ingenious suggestion, that the 'Church of Scotland was in 1603, as now, Presbyterian,' must be prepared to accept, as a corollary, that the Queen's Majesty is supreme in all causes ecclesiastical or spiritual within the limits of the 'Holy Kirk.'" So that because the Church of England chose to recognise King James, in 1603, as supreme governor in all causes ecclesiastical throughout his dominions; therefore, if the Church of Scotland (which did *not* do so) was then, as now, Presbyterian, the Queen is now *de facto* supreme in all causes ecclesiastical in the present Scotch Presbyterian Church. To state such an argument is to refute it.

I need hardly observe, that the acknowledgment of the Church of England of her own doctrine on the subject (and the Canon of course is nothing more) affords no proof of the state or views of other communions in the King's dominions. And certainly it could not make a communion Episcopal that had no true bishops belonging to it. In fact, it does not touch the question, whether the Church of Scotland was Presbyterian or Episcopal; for it might have been the latter, and yet not have recognised the Royal Supremacy as our Canons do, as is the case with the present Episcopal Church in Scotland. And the existence of this Church in Scotland, and even of the present Romish hierarchy in England, does not make it necessary for us to make the slightest alteration in the Canons.

The Bishop is, in fact, refuted by his own statements. For he contends that our Church is now in communion with the Episcopal Church existing in Scotland, which he calls the "Catholic and Apostolic Church of Scotland." Whether we are or not, I shall not now dispute; but, by his own shewing, our acknowledgment of the Royal Supremacy does not prevent our recognising as "the

Catholic and Apostolic Church of Scotland” a Church that does not thus acknowledge it.

But, adds his Lordship (p. 61), do not accuse me of being so uncharitable as to exclude such communities from *the benefit of my prayers*. I will pray for them as much as you please, but not as “a Branch of the Church of Christ.” “To pray for it [the Scotch Presbyterian “community”] as such, would be in truth to pray for the destruction of our own Church, for it is the avowed principle of that Presbyterian body to labour to that end.” (p. 61.) “I will pray for them among ‘our enemies, persecutors, and slanderers, and that it may please God to turn their hearts;’ but I will not pray for them AS A RELIGIOUS BODY—still less as a Church—least of all as the Church of Scotland,” &c. (p. 62.)

And is it really so hard a task to his Lordship’s Christian charity to recognise as a Church, or even as *a religious body*, those who are attacking our form of church-government and endeavouring to propagate their own?—so impossible a matter to own as a Christian brother one who thinks us in error on such a point, and perhaps in the warmth of his feelings gives us some very hard names? I will only say, that I trust there are many among us who do not sympathize with his Lordship in such feelings.

But of one thing the Bishop of Exeter will allow me to remind him; namely, that if such are his views, then *a fortiori* the Romish “community” must not be recognised in our prayers as “a Branch of the Church of Christ:” a consequence which, I suspect, his Lordship has forgotten.

In connection with this subject the Bishop finds it convenient to mention what, in the part where he ought to have specially taken it into account, he altogether passed over in silence; namely, that at the Restoration, in 1661, “this important *addition* was made” in the Preface to the Ordinal:—“or hath had formerly Episcopal consecration or ordination” (p. 63), which he calls a “decision of our Church” on “the indispensable necessity of Episcopal ordination;” but which, I need not remind the reader, applies only to our own Church.

And finally he observes, that “the persons designated for bishops” in Scotland, “though they struggled hard to assert the reality of their Presbyterian Orders, were required, as an indispensable condition before their consecration, to be first ordained deacons and priests, because they were ‘mere laymen;’ and this notwithstanding the precedent of 1610, when James’s bishops elect

were consecrated at once" (p. 64) : which is quite true, but which the following account of the matter by Bishop Burnet, the familiar friend of Leighton, who was one of them, will shew to be quite insufficient for the Bishop's purpose :—

"When the time fixed for the consecration of the bishops of Scotland came on, the English bishops finding that Sharp and Leightoun had not Episcopal ordination, as priests and deacons, the other two having been ordained by bishops before the wars, they stood upon it, that they must be ordained, first deacons and then priests. Sharp was very uneasy at this, and remembered them of what had happened when King James had *set up Episcopacy*. Bishop Andrews moved at that time the ordaining them, as was now proposed ; but that was overruled by King James, who thought it went too far towards the unchurching of all those who had no bishops among them. But the late war, and the disputes during that time, had raised these controversies higher, and brought men to stricter notions, and to maintain them with more fierceness. The English bishops did also say, that by the late Act of Uniformity that matter was more positively settled than it had been before ; so that they could not legally consecrate any, but those who were, according to that constitution, made first priests and deacons. *They also made this difference between the present time and King James's : for then the Scots were only in an imperfect state, HAVING NEVER HAD BISHOPS AMONG THEM SINCE THE REFORMATION ; so in such a state of things, in which they had been under a real necessity, IT WAS REASONABLE TO ALLOW OF THEIR ORDERS, how defective soever : but that of late they had been in a state of schism, had revolted from their bishops, and had thrown off that Order : so that Orders given in such a wilful opposition to the whole constitution of the primitive Church was a thing of another nature.*" (Burnet's Hist. of his own Times, i. 139, 140.)

From this passage two important conclusions follow : first, that these bishops fully recognised the fact, that the *validity* of the Orders of those consecrated in 1610 was admitted by the bishops who consecrated them ; and secondly, that these bishops held that there was good ground for so doing. I commend this to Chancellor Harington's consideration.

To the remarks on the Address of "the Devon and Cornwall Church of England Protestant Association" and the Archbishop's Answer (pp. 64, 65), I shall merely say, that no such conclusion follows from the Archbishop's answer as the Bishop has deduced from it ; namely, that the Archbishop has made "Orders depend on the soundness or unsoundness of the doctrines held by the persons whose Orders are in question." This is so obvious to any impartial reader, that I shall not waste words upon it. And with this charge his very characteristic attack upon the Archbishop for

an "ultra-Protestantism" "closely allied to Popery," falls to the ground.

The Bishop is very anxious that His Grace should enter into a discussion with him as to what is "the authority necessary to confer Holy Orders." (pp. 65, 66.) I suppose His Grace, if he thought any reply necessary, would refer his Lordship to the Articles of our Church, where he will find an answer to his question.

To his Lordship's inquiry, what the ministers of the Foreign Non-Episcopal Churches are to be considered, as he fears they may be "an order unknown to Scripture," I think his anxiety on that head may be at once relieved, by informing him, that they are evidently intended to correspond with the presbyters of whom we read in the Acts of the Apostles.

The Bishop here repeats the inference from the words in the Preface to the Ordinal, to which I have already replied.* But he adds, that "even if, for any special reasons of a local or temporary kind," in the case of foreigners a "prohibition of 'Bishops, Priests, or Deacons,' to execute any of the said [*i. e.* ministerial] functions *within our Church* be in any way justifiable, yet the absolute refusal to recognise them as ministers *in the Church of Christ*, would be an act so grossly schismatical, that no man of Catholic principles would know how to justify his continuing to communicate in the Church which is guilty of it." (p. 67.) I reply, Perhaps it would ; and I am glad to know, that our own Church does nothing of the kind, but, on the contrary, has clearly in her Articles extended the limits of a valid ministry beyond that which is constituted precisely according to her own rules, and by an overwhelming majority of her divines for a long period after the Reformation has directly recognised the validity of the Orders of various Non-Episcopal Churches. But it seems to me, that a *worse* case than that of a *Church* refusing to recognise such persons as "ministers in the Church of Christ," is that of one who, while bearing office in a Church that does *not* refuse such recognition, not only refuses, but reviles his Metropolitan for taking a different course—not only "himself refuses to receive the brethren, but forbiddeth them that would, and casteth them out of the Church."

Thus ends his Lordship's argument drawn from the Formularies and divines of our Church on the subject before us ; the remainder of the pamphlet being devoted to remarks upon the

* See p. 18 above.

present state of the Protestant Continental Churches, and the individuals who recently came over to this country from them.

I shall here, therefore, take the opportunity of briefly recapitulating the authorities I have before adduced on this subject, making some occasional additions to them as I proceed.

Thus,—not to notice the period of Edward VI., for which I have already given sufficient testimonies,*—we have for the reign of Elizabeth, when our Articles and Formularies were settled as they now (with few exceptions) stand,—Dr. Alley, bishop of Exeter in 1560, Dr. Pilkington, bishop of Durham in 1563, and the learned Dr. Whitaker, Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge at the close of the century—all testifying to the parity of bishops and presbyters as to their order, and the superiority of bishops in respect of *office* being only due to human appointment;† we have Bishop Jewell taking similar ground, and moreover testifying strongly to the non-necessity of bishops to constitute a Church;‡ we have Archbishop Whitgift distinctly maintaining that a presbyter and bishop are one “*quoad ministerium*,” and that the Scriptures do not “set down any one certain form and kind of government of the Church to be perpetual for all times, persons, and places, without alteration;” and that he does not “condemn any churches” where the Presbyterian form of church-government “is lawfully and without danger received:”§ we have Hooker testifying, as already stated:|| we have the High-Churchman Saravia expressly affirming the validity of the Orders of the Foreign Non-Episcopal Churches, and their right to act independently of other churches in the matter of Orders:¶ and Archbishop Whitgift assured Beza, that “the purpose of Dr. Saravia to assert degrees among the ministers of the Gospel was wholly undertaken without the injury or prejudice of any particular Church:”** we have Bishop Bridges saying in 1587 that the form of Ecclesiastical government may be varied, and that “we ought neither to condemn, or speak, or think evil of other good churches that use another Ecclesiastical government than we do:”†† we have Bishop Cooper, one of the leading defenders of our Church against the Puritans, asserting in 1589 that “one form of church-government is not necessary in all times and places of the Church;” and that he “doubted not,” that “all

* See p. 36 above.

† See Doct. of Ch. of Engl. &c., pp. 17, 18, 20.

‡ Ib. p. 18.

§ Ib. pp. 19, 20.

|| See pp. 37, 38 above, and ib. pp. 20, 21.

¶ Ib. pp. 21, 22.

** Strype's Whitgift, p. 405.

†† Doctrine, &c. p. 23.

those Churches in which the Gospel in those days, after great darkness, was first renewed, and the learned men whom God sent to instruct them," had "been directed by the Spirit of God to retain this liberty, that in external government and other outward orders, they might choose such as they thought in wisdom and godliness to be most convenient for the state of their country and disposition of the people:"* and we have the learned Dean of the Arches, Dr. Cosin, in 1584, laying it down, in express defence of the Foreign Reformed Churches, that it "cannot be proved, that any set and exact particular form" of church polity "is recommended unto us by the word of God."†

This was the ground they took against the Puritans, who insisted upon the exclusive divine right of the Presbyterian form of church-government. And instead of meeting this by a counter-claim of a similar kind, as the Bishop of Exeter would do, they protested against such a notion as totally unwarranted by Holy Scripture.

And for their practical treatment of the ministers of the Foreign Non-Episcopal Churches, we find Archbishops Parker, Grindal, and Sandys, Bishops Jewell, Parkhurst, Cox, Horn (to mention no others), writing to the ministers of those Churches as acknowledged and valued ministers of the Church of Christ;‡ and Archbishop Whitgift writing to Beza as "his most dear brother in Christ," and superscribing his letter to "his most dear brother and *colleague* in Christ, and faithful pastor of the Genevan Church."§

And against all these testimonies, the only shadow of an opposite testimony that can be brought for this period is that from Bishop Bilson, which I have already considered.||

Then, for the *practice* of our Church we have various testimonies, shewing that, by at least the great majority of our bishops, persons having only Presbyterian Orders were admitted to the cure of souls in our Church, until the period of the Restoration, without any fresh ordination.¶ I have before mentioned the case of Morrison, who had only Scotch Presbyterian Orders, but was licensed by Archbishop Grindal to minister the word and sacraments throughout the Province of Canterbury without any fresh

* Doctrine, &c. pp. 23, 24.

† Ib. p. 24. I must refer the reader to my former Tract for the full citation of these passages, from which alone he can see their real force.

‡ See Zurich Letters, published by Parker Society, *passim*.

§ Strype's Whitgift, 406, 408 : or, Ox. ed. ii. 159, 173.

|| See p. 38 above.

¶ See Doctrine, &c., p. 29.

ordination ; and have given the testimonies of Bishop Cosin (who, having been librarian to Overall, and chaplain to Neyle, is a most unexceptionable witness), and of Bishop Fleetwood, shewing that it was not the custom of our bishops, previous to the Restoration, to reordain those who had only Presbyterian Orders, when they admitted them to cures in this country.*

The same testimony is borne by Bishop Burnet, who says,—

“Another point was fixed by the Act of Uniformity, which was more at large formerly : *those who came to England from the Foreign Churches had not been required to be ordained among us* : but now all, that had not Episcopal ordination, were made incapable of holding any Ecclesiastical benefice.” (Hist. of his own Times, vol. i. p. 183.)

And even Mr. Keble confesses, that, “nearly up to the time when Hooker wrote, numbers had been admitted to the ministry of the Church in England, with no better than Presbyterian Ordination : and it appears by Travers’s Supplication to the Council, that such was the construction not uncommonly put upon the Statute of the 13th of Elizabeth, permitting those who had received Orders in any other form than that of the English Service Book, on giving certain securities, to exercise their calling in England.” (Pref. to Hooker, p. lxxvi.)

Even since the Restoration the ministrations of those who had only Presbyterian Orders were for a long course of years, up to nearly the present time, habitually used by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, which is under the special direction of the Bench of Bishops.†

And I will now add another case, that has lately come under my notice, that of Dr. De Laune, which is given in Dr. Birch’s Life of Archbishop Tillotson, from a letter of Bishop Cosin, a witness of the case, in the following terms :—

“Dr. De Laune, who translated the English Liturgy into French, being collated to a living, and coming to the Bishop, then at Norwich, with his presentation, his Lordship asked him where he had his Orders. He answered, that he was ordained by the Presbytery at Leyden. The Bishop upon this advised him to take the opinion of counsel, whether by the laws of England he was capable of a benefice without being ordained by a bishop. The doctor replied, that he thought his Lordship would be unwilling to reordain him, if his counsel should say, that he was not otherwise capable of the living by law. The Bishop rejoined,—‘Reordination we must not admit, no more than a rebaptization ; but *in case you find it doubtful whether you be a priest capable to receive a benefice among us, or no*, I will do the same office for you, if you desire it, that I should do for one who doubts of his baptism, when all things

* See Doctrine, &c., pp. 29, 30.

† Ib. p. 31.

belonging essentially unto it have not been duly observed in the administration of it, according to the rule in the Book of Common Prayer, *If thou beest not already, &c.* YET FOR MINE OWN PART, IF YOU WILL ADVENTURE THE ORDERS THAT YOU HAVE, I WILL ADMIT YOUR PRESENTATION, AND GIVE YOU INSTITUTION INTO THE LIVING HOWSOEVER.' But the title, which this presentation had from the patron, proving not good, there were no further proceedings in it; yet AFTERWARDS DR. DE LAUNE WAS ADMITTED INTO ANOTHER BENEFICE WITHOUT ANY NEW ORDINATION." (Birch's Life of Archbishop Tillotson, 2nd. ed. 1753, pp. 170, 171.)

And the only one of our early divines, of any weight, whom I can find to have denied the legality of the practice, and that only on account of "*the laws of the realm*," is Archbishop Whitgift.

And that the statute and not the ecclesiastical law was the difficulty, *where any was felt*, we learn from a passage in Bishop Hall, who expressly tells us in a work published in 1641,—

"The sticking at the admission of our brethren returning from Reformed Churches, was NOT IN CASE OF ORDINATION, *but of Institution*: THEY HAD BEEN ACKNOWLEDGED MINISTERS OF CHRIST, WITHOUT ANY OTHER HANDS LAID UPON THEM; but, *according to the laws of our land*, they were not *perhaps* capable of *Institution* to a benefice, unless they were so qualified as the Statutes of this realm do require. And secondly, *I know those, more than one, that by virtue only of that ordination which they have brought with them from other Reformed Churches, have enjoyed spiritual promotions and livings, WITHOUT ANY EXCEPTION AGAINST THE LAWFULNESS OF THEIR CALLING.*" (Bishop Hall's Defence of the Humble Remonstrance, Sect. 14. Works, ed. Pratt, vol. 9. pp. 690, 691.)

Now this practice of our Church from the Reformation to the Restoration, is the strongest possible proof that at least there was nothing in our Church's Formularies *against* the validity of such Orders, but on the contrary enough in its favour to justify such a course. And if so, *à fortiori* our Church admitted their validity for ministering in *their own* communions. And it cannot be pretended, that while the Articles of our Church remained the same, any alteration was made in her doctrine on this subject by the mere introduction, at the Restoration, of the regulation requiring Episcopal Orders for those who ministered in *our Church*.

In considering the views of our divines subsequent to the reign of Elizabeth, we shall no doubt find some discrepancy of opinion among them on this subject. But still we have an overwhelming majority in favour of the same view of the matter that prevailed before. It has been with some reason supposed, that one of the first, if not the very first, to question the validity of the Orders of the Foreign Non-Episcopal Churches, was Laud. Certainly so

early as 1604 he maintained this ground in the Divinity School at Oxford. When proceeding in that year to his degree of B.D., “his *Supposition*, when he answered in the Divinity Schools for his degree, concerning the efficacy of Baptism, was taken *verbatim* out of *Bellarmino*; and he then maintained, there could be no true Church without diocesan bishops, for which Dr. Holland, then Doctor of the Chair [Regius Professor of Divinity], openly reprehended him in the Schools for a seditious person, who would unchurch the Reformed Protestant Churches beyond seas, and now sow division between us and them, who were brethren, by this *novel Popish position*.” (Prynne’s *Life of Laud*, p. 2.) And this is confirmed by Heylin himself, who says,—“for which last [*i. e.* his position as to the necessity of bishops] he was shrewdly rattled by Dr. Holland above mentioned, as one that did endeavour to cast a bone of discord betwixt the Church of England and the Reformed Churches beyond the seas.” (Heylin’s *Life of Laud*, sub a. 1604.)

It is not a little remarkable, that the Popish doctrine of Baptism, and the indispensable necessity of the Episcopate to the existence of a true Church,—the two doctrines for which the Bishop of Exeter has been so vehemently contending against his Metropolitan,—should be the two principles with which Laud began his career. And I think we may derive instruction from the way in which an impartial investigator of our history at this period, our able historian Mr. Hallam, speaks of the re-introduction of the latter principle into our Church by Laud and his party :—

“The system,” he says, “pursued by Bancroft and his imitators, Bishops Neyle and Laud, with the approbation of the king, far opposed to the healing counsels of Burleigh and Bacon, was just such as low-born and little-minded men, raised to power by fortune’s caprice, are ever found to pursue. They studiously aggravated every difference, and irritated every wound . . . They began by preaching the divine right, as it is called, or absolute indispensability, of Episcopacy; *a doctrine of which the first traces, as I apprehend, are found about the end of Elizabeth’s reign*. They insisted on the necessity of Episcopal succession regularly derived from the Apostles. They drew an inference from this tenet, that ordinations by presbyters were in all cases null. And as this affected all the Reformed Churches in Europe, except their own, the Lutherans not having preserved the succession of their bishops, while the Calvinists had altogether abolished that order, they began to speak of them, not as brethren of the same faith, united in the same cause, and distinguished only by differences little more material than those of political commonwealths (WHICH HAD BEEN THE LANGUAGE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND EVER SINCE THE REFORMATION), but as aliens to whom they were not at all related, and schismatics with whom they held no communion; nay, as wanting the very essence of a Christian society. This again brought them

nearer, by irresistible consequence, to the disciples of Rome, whom, with becoming charity, but against the received creed of the Puritans, and perhaps against their own Articles, they all acknowledged to be a part of the Catholic Church, while they were withholding that appellation, expressly or by inference, from Heidelberg and Geneva." (Hallam's *Constit. Hist.* vol. i. pp. 389, 390, 4th ed.)

Mr. Hallam's opinion of the first introduction of this notion at the end of Elizabeth's reign, is taken from the passage of Lord Bacon, which I before quoted on this subject;* in which he speaks of "some indiscreet persons" having been so "bold," as to pronounce those "ordained in foreign parts" to be "no lawful ministers."

And I have already shewn, that the more eminent of those who leaned to this new school, such as Bishop Andrews and Archbishop Bramhall, were far from condemning the Foreign Non-Episcopal communities as wanting in the *essentials* of a Church, or the Orders of their ministers as absolutely *invalid*.†

In the same place I have added copious testimonies of the views of Archbishops Bancroft, Usher, Sancroft, Wake, Secker, and Howley, Bishops Hall, Davenant, Morton, George Downham, Cosin and Tomline, Lord Bacon, Deans Field and Sherlock, Archdeacon Mason, Drs. Crakanthorp, Willet and Claget, all shewing their cordial recognition of the Foreign Non-Episcopal Churches as true Branches of the Church of Christ, and of their ministers as true ministers of that Church.‡

And to this list it would be easy to add largely; but it is obvious, that the consentient testimony of *such names* represents a weight of evidence in favour of such a point much greater than the mere *number* would indicate; and therefore any addition seems to be unnecessary.

Nevertheless a few more shall be given here.

To the passage formerly quoted from Bishop Hall, the following may well be added:—

"The imputation pretended to be cast by this tenet [the Divine right of Episcopacy] upon all the Reformed Churches which want this government, I endeavoured so to satisfy, that I might justly decline the envy which is intended to be thereby raised against us: for which cause, I professed that we do 'love and honour those our Sister-Churches, as the dear Spouse of Christ;' and give zealous testimonies of my well-wishing to them. Your uncharitableness offers to choke me with those *scandalous censures and disgraceful terms*, which some of ours have let fall upon these churches, and

* See *Doctrine, &c.* p. 31.

† See *Doctrine, &c.* pp. 32, 33, where passages from Bishop Andrews and Archbishop Bramhall are given, fully proving this.

‡ *Ib.* pp. 34—44.

their eminent professors : which, I confess, it is more easy to be sorry for, than, on some hands, to excuse. The error of a few may not be imputed to all. My just defence is, that no such consequent can be drawn from our opinion : forasmuch as the Divine or Apostolical right, which we hold, goes not so high as if there were an express command, that, upon an absolute necessity, there must be either Episcopacy or no Church ; but so far only, that it both may and ought to be. How fain would you here find me in a contradiction ! *While I, onewhere, reckon Episcopacy amongst matters essential to the Church ; anotherwhere, deny it to be of the essence thereof ! Wherein you willingly hide your eyes, that you may not see the distinction that I make expressly betwixt the Being and the Well-being of a Church : affirming, that ‘ those Churches, to whom this power and faculty is denied, lose nothing of the true essence of a Church, though they miss something of their glory and perfection.’ No, Brethren, it is enough for some of your friends, to hold their Discipline altogether essential to the very being of a Church : we dare not be so zealous.”* (Bp. Hall’s Def. of Humble Remonstrance. Sec. 14. Wks. vol. ix. p. 690.)

We here see, that he throws back upon *the Puritans* the *exclusive* doctrine of the indispensability of one particular form of church-government, and disowns it : and also, that his general testimony to Episcopacy had been misunderstood and misrepresented, as if he had intended to deny the Foreign Non-Episcopal Churches to be true Churches : a fact which may shew, how easy it is to parade the appearance of a Catena of testimonies from our divines in favour of the exclusive doctrine, while nevertheless the authors of those testimonies meant nothing of the kind. I commend this to Chancellor Harington’s consideration.

Again, it is worth our notice, that our learned and esteemed divine, Dr. Crakanthorp, not only justifies the Foreign Non-Episcopal Churches, as I have before shewn, but distinctly admits that we are in communion with them, and that “in doctrine and the profession of the orthodox faith there is no difference between us.” For in the 43rd chapter of his “*Defensio Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*,” entitled, “*Ecclesiam Anglicanam hæreticam esse, quia communicat cum Reformatis Ecclesiis ultramarinis, calumniatur Arch. Spal.*” &c., he says,—

“ ‘*Ecclesia,*’ inquis, ‘*Anglicana communionem publice et aperte profitetur cum Genevensi aliisque ultramarinis Ecclesiis. Etiam et Londini sunt regia concessione Gallis, Belgis, Italis, apertæ Ecclesiæ. Hæ vero omnes Calviniano veneno infectæ. Ipsa quoque Geneva, Puritanorum mater. Ab his Puritanismus in Anglia fovetur et promovetur. Hæ Anglicanam professionem et ritus abominantur : et tamen Anglicanæ Synagogæ sorores sunt dilectissimæ.*’ Quare cum Anglicana cum his hæreticis Ecclesiis communionem teneat, erit et ipsa quoque hæretica. Imo nec Anglicana est, nec illæ hæreticæ ; sed tu homo ex convitiis et mendaciis totus conflatus, et Anglicanæ et *illis s. v. is*

Dei Ecclesiis novus Shemi ore inverecundo oblatras. . . . Nec certe 'doctrinam illi aut professionem Anglicanam abominantur.' Calumnia hæc tua est, cujus si pudor tibi ullus inesset, pœnituisse te jamdudum oportuisset. In doctrina et fidei orthodoxæ professione discordia inter nos nulla. Hac integra, in ritibus et disciplina discrimen ferendum utrique scimus." (Crakanth. Defens. Eccles. Angl. contra. Arch. Spalat. 1625. 4to. c. 43. p. 253 et seq.)

Among our learned divines Dr. John White, brother of Bishop Francis White, takes a high place. In his "Way to the True Church," first published in 1608, he expressly includes the Foreign Non-Episcopal Churches as forming with the Church of England the Protestant Church. For in meeting the Romish objection that "the Protestants' Church is not perfectly one, or uniform in dogmatical points of faith," he says, "we for our purgation name the Harmony of Confessions, wherein the particular Churches set down and name the Articles of their faith: the which Confessions if the Jesuit can shew to jar, as he saith, in dogmatical points of faith, I am content you believe him in all the rest." (Ed. 1624. § 33. p. 75.) And he entirely repudiates the notion that ministerial succession is an essential note of the true Church. He says,—

"The succession required to make a Church Apostolic must be defined by the *doctrine* and not by the *place* or *persons*: that is to say, they must be reputed the Apostles' successors which believe the Apostles' doctrine, *although they have not this outward succession of pastors* visibly following one another in one place throughout all ages, as the Jesuit saith it is in the Roman Church." "It is no disadvantage to the Protestants' Churches, if holding the Apostles' doctrine they want external succession of place and persons, such as the Jesuit boasteth of: because the apostolickness of the Church is not defined by it, but *wheresoever the true faith contained in the Scriptures is professed and embraced, there is the whole and full nature of an Apostolic Church.*" (Ib. § 53. p. 210.) "The Jesuit objecteth, that 'God hath planted a Church to endure in all ages, wherein he will have a visible succession of teachers,' preserved from failing in the true faith; and therefore none are sent of God but such as come in this 'ordinary' manner, called and succeeding 'visibly,' and with 'peculiar consecration,' which Christ termeth entering in by the door. The antecedent whereof is false. For though God's ordinance be, that he have a Church, and teachers therein, in all ages, succeeding one another, and standing in the truth; *yet he hath made no law that this succession shall be 'visible,' or with 'peculiar consecration,' as the Jesuit meaneth them.*" "Yea, our very adversaries deny not, but a man may be a lawful minister, though a bishop never consecrated him, but a simple priest, by dispensation; and whereas the *common opinion in the Church of Rome is, that a bishop differeth not from a priest in order, but in jurisdiction only, hence it followeth, unavoidably, that jure divino a simple priest may ordain, because the power of ordaining belongeth not to jurisdiction but to order, as they call it.* The which point will serve to avoid all that the Jesuit hath said in this section, though we should say no more." (Ib. § 58. pp. 229, 230.)

This treatise was defended against the Romanists by his brother Francis, bishop of Carlisle, in a work entitled, "The orthodox faith and way to the Church explained and justified," in which he expressly vindicates the position, that "personal succession" is not an essential note of the Church (2nd ed. 1624. p. 49.), and that the Foreign "Protestant Churches" are at unity with the Church of England in all essential points. (Ib. pp. 124 & 132, 133.)

Another important testimony is that of the learned John Forbes, —son of Bishop Patrick Forbes, and appointed Divinity Professor at Aberdeen in 1619, and ejected in 1640 on account of his adherence to the cause of Episcopacy and Charles I.,—occurring in his *Irenicum*, first printed in 1629. And it will be the more esteemed, I suppose, by those who take the opposite view to that I am now maintaining, when I mention, that he distinctly advocates the *Jus Divinum* of the Episcopal form of church-government. One of the propositions which he lays down, and defends at some length, is the following :—

"Ecclesia Orthodoxam tenens fidem, si careat Episcopo, sive Presbyterorum ordinario præfecto Diœcesano, laborat quidem defectu quodam œconomico : at non propterea desinit esse vera Ecclesia, neque excidit potestate illa Ecclesiastica, quam habent aliæ Ecclesiæ ab Episcopis gubernatæ. Quamvis optandum et annitendum, ut habeat Episcopum."

And on this proposition he remarks :—

"Gradus quidem Episcopalis est juris divini ; sic tamen ut Ecclesia esse non desinat, sed esse possit, et sit quandoque vera Ecclesia Christiana, in qua non reperitur hic gradus Non ad esse, sed ad melius esse Ecclesiæ necessaria est hæc œconomia Valida est ordinatio quæ peragitur per presbyteros in eis Ecclesiis, in quibus non est Episcopus, aut ubi non est orthodoxus, sed notorius hæreticus et lupus : quamvis decentius fieret (si possibile) per orthodoxum Episcopum et Presbyteros ; aut etiam per solos presbyteros, consentiente et concedente Episcopo Habent Presbyteri de jure divino ordinandi, sicut prædicandi et baptizandi, potestatem : quamvis hæc omnia exsequi debeant sub regimine et inspectione Episcopi, in locis ubi est Episcopus, sicut dictum est. In aliis autem locis, ubi Ecclesiæ communitantùm Presbyterorum consilio administrantur, valida est et efficax ordinatio quæ fit per impositionem manuum solius Presbyterii. Quin et ubi est Episcopus, possunt Presbyteri ordinare, consentiente, licet non simul manus imponente, Episcopo : cui propria de jure divino est sola autoritas et præfectura Episcopalis. ordinare autem non possunt [presbyteri] sine particulari commissione ab Episcopo, vel a Presbyterorum Diœcesano Concilio in locis ubi non est Episcopus." (J. Forbes. *Irenicum*, lib. ii. c. xi. Prop. 13, Op. Amstel. 1703, vol. i. p. 420—422.)

The Bishop of Exeter has referred to the 19th Article as supporting his views of the necessity of Episcopacy to constitute a

Church. The following passage of our learned Bingham—the most deeply versed in ecclesiastical antiquity, perhaps, of any of our divines—will shew how little notion he had that such a view could be extracted from it. After quoting this Article, and stating that none of our divines object to it on account of its not mentioning “bishops or their government,” he adds,—

“For in all their disputes with the Papists, they never require more than *these two* notes of the Church. They say with Bishop Andrews, ‘that though Episcopal government be of Divine institution, yet it is not so absolutely necessary, as that there can be no Church, nor sacraments, nor salvation without it. He is blind that sees not many Churches flourishing without it; and he must have a heart as hard as iron, that will deny them salvation. Something may be wanting, that is of Divine right, in the exterior regimen of the Church, and yet salvation be obtained therein.’ Now this is *the case of the French Church*, which Bishop Andrews and his followers *allow to have all the necessary and essential notes of a true Church, though Episcopal government was never settled among them.*” (French Church’s Apol. for Church of England, Bk. 2. c. 2. Works, ix. 40, 41.)

In the debate on *Occasional Conformity*, in 1702, Dr. Sharp, archbishop of York, stated, that “if he were abroad, he would willingly communicate with the Protestant Churches, where he should happen to be.” (Life of Abp. Sharp, vol. i. p. 377.)

In the debate on the Union with Scotland, in 1707, Dr. Tenison, archbishop of Canterbury, said, “he thought the narrow notions of all Churches had been their ruin, and that *he believed the Church of Scotland to be as true a Protestant Church as the Church of England*, though he could not say it was as perfect.” (Carstares, 759, as quoted by Mr. Hallam, Constit. Hist. 4th ed. ii. 483.)

I will quote but one more testimony out of the vast body of evidence that might be given from our divines on this subject, and that shall be from Dr. John Scott, who, though no Low-Churchman, and taking very high views as to the Divine right of Episcopacy and the Episcopal succession, says,—

“A Church may be debarred of it by unavoidable necessities, in despite of its power, and against its consent, and under this circumstance I can by no means think such a Church to be separated from the Church Catholic; it is indeed an imperfect and defective part of the Catholic Church; *and if this defect of it be any way owing to its own NEGLIGENCE, it is a very great FAULT in it, as well as an unhappiness.* But though this instituted government is necessary to the *perfection* of a Church, yet it doth not therefore follow that it is necessary to the *being* of it. . . . Why may we not reasonably suppose, that the Catholic Church will admit presbyters to govern and ordain, where there are no bishops to be had, since it hath admitted laymen to baptize, where there are neither bishops nor presbyters to be had? since the

latter is as great a deflection from positive institution as the former." (Christian Life, 5th ed. 1747. vol. iii. p. 310—313.)

Into his Lordship's remarks, occupying nearly the whole of the remainder of his pamphlet, upon the present state of the Foreign Protestant Churches, and upon the individual members of those Churches who recently came over to this country, I shall not enter, because my object has been to discuss *principles*, not their particular application. To do justice to the subject would require a much more extended examination of it than his Lordship's *ex parte* statements afford, or than would be possible in this place.

I shall merely observe, that, *speaking generally*, the Public Confessions of those Churches are before the world; and that, however much many of their members may have departed from their true meaning, it would be as unjust to renounce all brotherly communion with their sound members, as it would be for *them* to renounce all communion with every member of *our* Church, because of the Romish views of many of our clergy. And as to any who may have been forced to separate from those Churches on account of the corruptions prevailing in them, and form a separate body holding an orthodox confession of faith, such have a still stronger claim upon us for our sympathy and Christian fellowship.

But I may be permitted to ask his Lordship this question:—*Was he, or was he not, a consenting party to the Letter sent in 1835 by the late Archbishop of Canterbury, in the name of himself and his "BROTHER BISHOPS," to "the Moderator of the Company of Pastors at Geneva," expressing their "high respect for the Protestant Churches on the Continent," and speaking of the Genevan Reformation as a "noble achievement, which brought light out of darkness, and rescued their Church from the shackles of Papal domination and the tyrannical imposition of a corrupt faith, and a superstitious ritual," wrought by "illustrious men, who, under the direction of Almighty God, were the instruments of this happy deliverance," "an event not less glorious to Geneva than conducive to the success of the Reformation"?*

It is scarcely to be supposed, that such a Letter should have been sent by the late Archbishop in the name of his "*brother bishops*" without the knowledge or assent of the Bishop of Exeter. And certainly incredible, that if he had dissented from it, his dissent should not have been made known to the public. If, therefore, such a Letter as this was sent with the sanction of the Right Reverend Prelate, with what face can he now turn round upon the

present Archbishop, and assail him as he has for holding that the ministers of "the Protestant Churches on the Continent" are true ministers of Christ? He cannot venture to assert that the state of things in those Churches is worse now than it was then.

May I be permitted also to remind his Lordship, that it is not so many years since he himself was on a Committee formed for the purpose of obtaining aid for the Vaudois Pastors. Now if, as his Lordship here tells us, the administration of the Lord's Supper by such persons is "a profane mockery," that its effects are obtainable "only" through an Episcopal ministry,* and that persons not Episcopally ordained "have no other title" to the ministry "than their own presumption, or the presumption of men like themselves, who have dared to affect to confer it on them" (p. 83), and that "we see not any promise of a blessing" to such a ministry (p. 87), then, surely, to be on the Committee of a Society formed for the purpose of aiding such "profane mockery" and "presumption," is an act for which it is difficult to account in one who has such high views of Christian duty. Certainly the claims of charity can be no sufficient defence. The only true charity would have been, to have warned them of the fatal delusion under which they were acting, and urged them, at the peril of their salvation and that of their flocks, to receive the imposition of Episcopal hands; and to have withheld any aid until this was done.

Nay more; I would ask his Lordship, where we can find his indignant protests against the course pursued for so many years by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (of which his Lordship is *ex officio* a leading governor) of sending out missionaries not having Episcopal Orders? Such matters usually come before the public. But I am unable to find that there was any movement, on the part of his Lordship, on the subject. At any rate it must have been one of very recent date.

Why, then, may I ask, was all his indignation in this matter reserved for his present Metropolitan?

There is another point also which his Lordship will, I hope, permit me to bring under his attention. He has, in various parts of his present pamphlet, thrown out divers remarks about *Calvinism* and *Calvinists*, as something quite inconsistent with the doctrine of the Church of England. (See pp. 45, 46, &c.)

Let me remind him of the words in which a divine whose autho-

* Christ "gave to His Church—celebrating it as he celebrated, but only so,—and by those whom *He* authorized, but *ONLY* by them [the meaning of which words the Bishop has himself told us]—a holy sacrament which should be," &c. (p. 83.)

riety he will respect, once rebuked a celebrated statesman for speaking slightly of "Calvinists" :—

"To the peculiar tenets of that denomination of Christians, to which you appear to allude, I am very far from subscribing; but thus much I will say, that *no man, who knows what they really are, will ever treat them with contempt.* You, Sir, do not appear to have yet risen above THE VULGAREST PREJUDICES on this subject; *else, you would have known, that opinions which have commended themselves to the full and firm conviction of SOME OF THE ABLEST, AS WELL AS HOLIEST, MEN WHO HAVE EVER ADORNED OUR CHURCH, are not to be thus blown down by 'the whiff and wind' of the smartest piece of rhetoric ever discharged in your honourable House.*"

Such were the terms in which the Rev. Dr. Phillpotts addressed the Right Hon. George Canning in 1825, in his "Letter" to him on the Roman Catholic Bill of that year. (pp. 106, 107.) I may fairly hope, then, that the Bishop of Exeter will remember this indignant remonstrance of Dr. Phillpotts; and pause to reflect, before he singles out for his reproaches, or again endeavours, as he has of late been doing, to drive out of the Church, those whose only crime it is, to hold the same views with "SOME OF THE ABLEST, AS WELL AS HOLIEST, MEN WHO HAVE EVER ADORNED OUR CHURCH."

There remains but one point more for notice in his Lordship's "Letter;" and that is one which, among all the extraordinary specimens we have lately had of his Lordship's qualifications for the high post he has assumed to himself in our Church, is perhaps entitled to the first place. It occurs in the last page of his "Letter." Unfortunately for his Lordship, a piece of information was brought him which he calls a "particular of very great moment in this discussion with which I have only recently become acquainted," namely, "the form of Ordination used among Calvinists." And upon this the Bishop thus comments :—

"Our Church regards the Christian ministry as a commission from God himself, and confers it *in His name.* Not so the 'Reformed' communities, so far as I can find. In 'The Discipline of the Reformed Churches of France,' 'The Form of Ordination' is as follows :—'That it may please God to vouchsafe grace unto this Elect Person, a short Prayer shall be conceived to this purpose : "O Lord God, we beseech thee to endow with the gifts and graces of thy Holy Spirit this thy servant lawfully chosen according to that Order established in thy Church, and abundantly to enrich him with all abilities needful for his acceptable performance of the duties of his office to the glory of Thy Holy name, the edification of Thy Church, and his own salvation, whom *we now dedicate and consecrate unto Thee* by this our ministry."*'* Compare with this our own Ordinal : 'Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins, &c., in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' I stop not to discuss the causes of this

difference. *It is enough to say, that they are* ESSENTIALLY DIFFERENT; that the one professes to confer a commission from God *in His name*, whereas the other simply ‘dedicates and consecrates unto God’ the person ordained. THE PLAIN CONSEQUENCE IS, THAT THERE CAN BE NO INJUSTICE IN DENYING THAT THE LATTER HAS ANY COMMISSION FROM GOD; HIS OWN ORDINATION DOES NOT PROFESS TO GIVE IT.”

Now it is difficult to know in what terms to speak of such a passage as this. Were it not for the tone and position assumed by the writer, one might be inclined on several grounds to pass it by with the slightest possible notice, and throw a veil over it. But, under present circumstances, when his Lordship is misleading a host of our younger clergy to the borders of Rome, and teaching them to vilify the authorities of Church and State as ignorant or incompetent persons for not adopting his views of orthodoxy, it is absolutely necessary plainly to point attention to such proofs of the nature of the guidance to which they are submitting: especially as this “Letter” of his Lordship has received from his party the highest encomiums as a most able and masterly performance. Is there no kind friend whom his Lordship can consult, before he thus commits himself in a way that brings reproach upon the Church as well as himself?

Is his Lordship, then, really ignorant of the notorious fact that nearly twelve centuries passed over the Church before those words, “Receive the Holy Ghost,” &c., were introduced into the Ordination Service? Does he really need to be informed, what was the character of the early Ordination Services of the Church, and that he has actually invalidated the ministry of the whole probably of the early Western Church, and left the ministry of the Greek Church to this day in a rather dubious position?

I shall have a few remarks to make presently on the correctness of his Lordship’s statement as to what is done in the French Church. But I will first deal with it precisely as it stands.

Now first, as to the use of the formula, “Receive the Holy Ghost,” &c., we have the authority of the learned Morinus, in his standard treatise on the subject of Ordinations, that it was unknown in the Church for *twelve centuries*. He says,—

“Dispicimus an illa postrema manus impositio, cum qua jungitur illa formula, ‘Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, quorum remisistis peccata,’ &c., sit formaliter vera et antiqua Sacerdotii forma, aut pars illius, quam Apostoli et antiqui nobis tradiderunt. . . . Tota illa ceremonia, et secundum materiam, et secundum formam, et secundum circumstantias, MILLE DUCENTIS ANNIS incognita fuit in Ecclesia Dei. Nulli rituales ante hoc tempus illius meminerunt, licet copiosi sint, et singulos ritus pauci momenti sigillatim describebant. Imo nonnulli sunt eo tempore longe recentiores, et diffusi admodum,

qui illam prætereunt." (Morin. De Ordin. Pt. 3, Exerc. 7. c. 2. ed. 1695. p. 106.)

"Verba illa, 'Accipe Spiritum Sanctum,' ab antiquis Latinis usurpata non fuisse; et consequenter nec Ordinationis Presbyteralis, nec cujusvis alterius, formam fuisse, præter argumenta jam allegata, ex omnium ritualium et autorum antiquorum, qui de officiis ecclesiasticis scripserunt, profundo silentio petita, demonstrant evidenter nonnulla alia quæ hic subijcimus." (Ib. c. 5. p. 118.)

The same learned author maintains at large,—

"Solam manuum impositionem Presbyteratus esse materiam." "Hanc solam omnis Ecclesia, Latina, Græca, Barbara, semper agnovit. Hanc solam commemorant omnes antiqui Rituales, Latini, Græci; omnes antiqui et recentiores Patres, Græci, Latini." (Ib. c. 1. pp. 102, 103.)

And he points to all the old Greek Rituals and Fathers as shewing that in the ordination of a Presbyter *nothing more was necessary than imposition of hands and prayer*. He says:—

"Legantur et relegantur præcedentes Græcarum Ordinationum ἀκολουθίαι, seu rituales; legatur S. Clemens, Sanctus Dionysius, nihil aliud sedula lectione deprehendes præter manuum impositionem et orationem, quod materiæ et formæ rationem induere possit. Sed consideretur præsertim S. Dionysius qui ritus istos diligenter persequitur, mystice et tropologice multis verbis explicat; versentur et revolvantur ipsius verba, nihil aliud præter manuum impositionem et orationem, aut si vis addere genuflexionem, tibi occurret, cui substantiale aliquid possis affingere." (Ib. c. 1. p. 104.)

And now let us see, from the words of some of the ancient Ordination Services of the Western Church, *what sort of prayers they were* which, at that time, accompanied the imposition of hands. The Bishop tells us, that the Service of the French Church, though it has retained the imposition of hands, yet, by only praying for spiritual gifts, and saying, "*whom we now dedicate and consecrate unto thee by this our ministry,*" is *essentially* defective, and the party so ordained has no commission from God, and so, in his Lordship's view, is not really ordained at all.

In the great work of Morinus on this subject, written in the middle of the 17th century, are given some forms of Ordination from various very ancient Rituals of the Western Church. The first is from a MS. which was then eleven centuries old, which carries us back to the middle of the 6th century, and appears to have belonged to the Church of Poitiers. I need hardly say, that the laying on of hands, and offering up the prayers there given, form the whole service. And now let us see *what the prayers are*. The prayer "ad Presbyteros ordinandos" is this,—"*Exaudi nos Deus salutaris noster, et super hunc famulum tuum benedictionem Spiritus S. et gratiæ sacerdotalis effunde virtutem, ut quem*

tuæ pietatis suspectibus *offerimus consecrandum*, perpetua muneris tui largitate persequaris. Per Dominum.” Then follows the prayer of “Consecration,” which, after an opening in general terms, proceeds thus,—“*Da quæsumus*, omnipotens Pater, in hoc famulo tuo illo *Presbyterii dignitatem*: Innova in visceribus ejus Spiritum sanctitatis,” &c. Then comes the “Consummatio Presbyteri,” which commences with the following exhortation to the people,—“Sit nobis fratres communis oratio, ut his [hic] qui in adjutorium et utilitatem vestræ salutis eligetur, *Presbyteratus benedictionem divini indulgentia muneris consequatur*, et S. Spiritus sacerdotalia dona privilegio virtutum, ne impar loco deprehendatur, obtineat per suum.* Per.” And then follows the prayer of “Benediction,”—“Sanctificationum omnium autor, *cujus vera consecratio, plena benedictio est*, Tu, Domine, super hunc famulum ill. *quem Presbyterii honore DEDICAMUS*, manum tuæ benedictionis in eum infunde, ut gravitate actuum et censura vivendi probet se esse seniore,” &c. &c.

And I may just add, that the prayers at the ordination of a deacon and the consecration of a bishop are of a similar kind, the words in the prayer of Consecration for a deacon being, if possible, a still more exact counterpart of those in the French Service,—“Super hunc famulum tuum quæsumus, Domine, placatus intende, *QUEM TUIS SACRIS SERVITURUM IN OFFICIUM DIACONI SUPPLICITER DEDICAMUS*.” (Morin. l. c. Pt. 2. pp. 214, 215.)

Here, then, we find nothing beyond a dedication of the person to the office, and humble prayer for the gifts of the Spirit to fit him for the right discharge of its duties. In a word, we have the precise form of Ordination which the Bishop tells us is essentially defective.

The next Ordinal given by Morinus is from a MS. then nine hundred years old, where the title to the Ordination Services is “Ordo qualiter in Romana sedis Apostolicæ Ecclesia Presbyteri, Diaconi vel Subdiaconi eligendi sunt.” And here again, the prayers are, as far as our present subject is concerned, exactly of the same kind, the same words indeed being used,—“Quos tuæ pietatis aspectibus *offerimus consecrandos*”—“super hos famulos tuos *quos Presbyterii honore dedicamus*, manum tuæ benedictionis his infunde.” (Ib. p. 217.)

The next is from a MS. then eight hundred years old, in which is given the “Ordo qualiter in Romana Ecclesia Diaconi et Pres-

* These two words *per suum* are probably added by a misprint.

byteri ordinandi sunt ;” in which the same prayers are found. (Ib. p. 221.)

And these, in short, are followed by Ordination Services from various other very ancient MSS. belonging originally to different places in the Western Church, all of the same kind, and most of them in precisely the same words on the point we are now considering. So that here we see the general form of Ordination that prevailed for several centuries in the Western Church.

And the nature of these Services is in strict conformity with the testimony of the early Fathers, both Greek and Latin, as to what was considered necessary for Ordination, which they represent as being imposition of hands and prayer.

Thus Theodoret, telling us of the ordination of a hermit performed by the bishop of a neighbouring city, who sought him out for the purpose, says that he entered the place where he was, and “laid his hand upon him and offered the prayer, and spake much to him,” &c.*

And so Jerome says, that the ordination of the clergy is fulfilled, “not merely by the prayer of the voice over them, but by the imposition of the hand.”†

And, to cite no more, the Apostolical Constitutions (as they are called) speak only of the imposition of hands and prayer in their account of the form of ordination for a presbyter ; and the prayer of Consecration there given is merely a supplication to God for his grace to fit the person ordained for the duties of his office.‡ And in the Form given in these Constitutions for the appointment of a bishop, there is not even imposition of hands ; which is, it should be observed, another testimony for the parity of Order in bishops and presbyters. After the people and presbyters present have been asked, whether they are satisfied with the person elected, and have testified in his favour, one of three bishops standing near the altar is to offer a prayer to God for a blessing upon him, some deacons holding the Gospels open upon his head. After the prayer, one of the bishops is to give him the eucharistic elements (τὴν θυσίαν), and the next morning he is enthroned by the rest of the bishops, all of them kissing him ; and after the reading of certain portions of Holy Scripture, he gives the blessing, and preaches to the

* Τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶθῆκε, καὶ τὴν εὐχὴν ἐπετέλεισε, καὶ πολλὰ μὲν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔφη. Theodoret. Philotheus, seu Relig. Hist. c. 19. Op. Hal. 1771. tom. 3. p. 1232.

† Non solum ad imprecationem vocis, sed ad impositionem impletur manus. Hieron. Comment. in Is. c. 58. v. 10. Op. ed. Vallars. tom. 4. col. 694, 695.

‡ Constit. Apostol. lib. viii. c. 16.

people, and then follows the Communion Service. (Constit. Apostol. lib. viii. cc. 4 et seq.)

In fact, his Lordship need not have gone further than our own Bingham to have discovered his error; who expressly says, and quotes sufficient authorities to prove it, that "it is plain, the ancient Form was only imposition of hands and a Consecration-prayer." And having given the Consecration-prayer in the Apostolical Constitutions, he says,—

"Where we may observe, that it was not then thought necessary to express all or any of the offices of a presbyter in particular, but *only in general to pray for grace to be given to the priest then ordained, whereby he might be enabled to perform them. And this, with a solemn imposition of hands, was reckoned a sufficient form of consecration.*" (Antiq. bk. 2. c. 19. § 17.)

The French Service, therefore, is more consonant with the Forms of the earlier and purer period of the Church than our own.

And now let me remind his Lordship of the *consequences* of the doctrine he has thus propounded. He has shivered to atoms the whole doctrine of the Apostolical Succession, for he has left the whole Western Church without any Orders at all. He has not left us even my poor "Low-Church" notion on the subject. I *did* think, we in the Church of England had something more to say in favour of the *regularity* of our Orders than other recently-constituted Bodies, who have been driven by circumstances to somewhat *irregular* courses; heartily as I repudiate the *Tractarian doctrine* of Apostolical Succession. But his Lordship has swept away even this. He is, upon his own shewing, equally destitute of valid Orders with any of those whom he has so fiercely attacked in his Letter for "profane mockery" and "presumption;" for his golden chain of legitimate succession, instead of reaching to the Apostles, runs back only a third of the way. And what is more, I am afraid there is no Church on earth that can help him out of his dilemma. For the Greek form of Ordination, even if it could be proved to have been uninterruptedly used, is far from coming up to his standard. For the Bishop in the Greek Church does not do more than recognise God's supposed call of the ordained person to the office of presbyter, and *His use* of the Ordainer's ministry for the external consecration of such person to that office.

The Greek Bishop, on laying his hand upon the head of the person to be ordained a presbyter, says,—“The Divine grace, which healeth that which is weak, and supplieth the wants of that which is defective, promoteth this most pious deacon to be a presbyter. Let us therefore pray over him, that the grace of the most Holy Spirit

may come upon him." And in the Prayer occur these words,—
 “to whom *Thou* hast vouchsafed that he should be promoted by
 me.” (ὃν ἡγδόκησας προχειρισθῆναι παρ’ ἐμοῦ.)

And the Form for consecrating a Bishop is of a similar kind.
 And in the prayer at the Ordination of a deacon, any power or
 commission in the Ordainer to communicate grace by the imposition
 of his hands is distinctly repudiated, for it is said,—“Fill him with
 all faith and love, &c., for *not by the imposition of my hands*, but
 by the superintending agency of thy rich mercies (ἐν τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ τῶν
 πλουσίων σου οἰκτιρμῶν) is grace given to *those worthy of thee*.”

I take this from the last edition of the Ἀρχιερατικὸν (printed at
 the Patriarchal press at Constantinople in 1820 for the use of the
 Greek Bishops), which I obtained direct from Constantinople.

This, no doubt, the Bishop will think much *better* than such a
 Form as that he has referred to, or the old Services of the Western
 Church; and as the validity of his own Orders stands *self-condemned*,
 he may like to avail himself of the superior privileges of
 the Greek Church, to which certainly there can be no objection.
 It will be but reasonable.

But before I dismiss this subject, I must add one word as to
 the correctness of the Bishop's statement with relation to the
 French Church. He complains that the French Church does not
 profess to confer a commission from God *in his name*. Now if his
 Lordship had looked only to the page previous to that from which
 he has quoted, he would have found that Canon 5 directs, that
 “the Assembly remonstrating to him [the person to be ordained]
 the duty of that office whereunto he is called, shall further declare
 that power which is GIVEN HIM IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST,
 to minister both in the Word and Sacraments.”*

And further, it would have been well, if his Lordship had recol-
 lected, that the original of the Canon he was quoting was *in French*,
 and therefore that before he made it the subject of such a serious
 charge against the whole Reformed French Church, it would have
 been wise to have ascertained how it stood in the original.
 The words in the original are not “whom we now dedicate and con-
 secrate unto Thee by this our ministry,” but, “who *is* now dedicated
 and consecrated by our ministry,” (est maintenant dédié et consacré
 par notre ministère†); which is very similar to the Greek Form.

* Quick's Synodicon, vol. i. p. xvii.

† Conformité de la Discipline Ecclesiastique des Protestans de France, &c.
 1678, 4to. By M. Larroque, whose name is appended to the Dedicatory Epistle.

Such, then, is the character of his Lordship's censure upon the Form of Ordination in the French Reformed Church. He is evidently totally unacquainted with the Ordination-Services of the Primitive Church for many centuries, he assumes the indispensable necessity of the particular Form that happens to occur in our own Service, which was not introduced till the 12th century, and he flings his random reproaches at other Churches in a way that makes them so recoil upon himself and his own Church as to deprive both of any valid Orders.

It is however, it must be confessed, nothing more than what might be expected as the consequence of that deeply-rooted evil from which our Church is, and has long been, suffering. Church, State, and Universities long combined to treat all such knowledge as of no more value than an old almanack. And the result has been, as might be expected, the present state of profound, chaotic, and hopeless confusion in our Church.

But his Lordship has one more charge to bring against the French Reformed Church. He says :—

“ In conformity with these different views of the nature of the Christian ministry, is the view taken of the indelibility of Holy Orders. We regard them as *simply indelible* ; even degradation, though it disables the party from exercising any ministry, does not erase the *character*. Not so the ‘Reformed,’—whose XIth Canon is, ‘Such as are chosen unto the ministry of the Gospel must know, that they be in that office for term of life ; unless they be *discharged upon good and certain considerations, and that by the Provincial Synod.*’ ”

Now, in the first place, this Canon does not touch the question of the indelibility of the character imparted by Holy Orders, for it does not state in what condition the person is who is discharged from the ministry. And in all Churches there is a power in the Church to take away the “office” of minister in that Church on good and sufficient grounds. And if his Lordship means to intimate, that the person thus discharged would so have lost his Orders in the French Church by this discharge, that if at any subsequent time he was found fit and competent to fulfil the duties of the office, he would have to be reordained, the 53rd French Canon shews his mistake ; for it enacts, that “ministers deposed” “for slighter faults, upon confession of them, they may be restored by the Provincial Synod, but with this condition, to serve in another Province, and not in their own.” (Quick, Synod. i. xxvi.)

And as to the Bishop's statement of the doctrine of our Church on the subject, I shall merely place by the side of it the following remarks of our learned Ecclesiastical antiquary Bingham.

"The full import of the phrase, and the adequate notion of reducing a clergyman to lay-communion, is totally degrading and depriving him of his Orders; that is, the power and authority of his clerical office and function, and reducing him to the state and quality and simple condition of a layman. *This supposes a power in the Church, not only of conferring Clerical Orders at first to men, and promoting them from laymen to be bishops, or presbyters, or deacons; but also a power of recalling these offices, and divesting them of all power and authority belonging to them, by degrading clergymen upon just reasons, and reducing them to the state and quality of laymen again.* This is undoubtedly the true meaning of all those ancient canons and writers, which speak so often of degrading clergymen for their offences, and allowing them only to communicate in the quality of laymen. Hereby they were deprived of their order and office, and power and authority, and even the name and title of clergymen; and reputed and treated as private Christians, wholly divested of all their former dignity, and clerical powers and privileges, and reduced entirely to the state and condition of laymen." "The plain result of this discourse is, that reducing a clergyman to the communion of laymen was a total deprivation and divesting him of his office and Orders. So that if he now pretended to act as a minister, his actions were reputed null and void, and, as no other than the actions of a layman. The learned Dr. Forbes has rightly observed this (Iren. lib. 2. c. 11.) in the ancient discipline, and I cannot better express it than in his words: 'He that is deposed with a plenary and perfect deposition, cannot now validly exercise the offices that belong to his order, because he *wants his order and the power of his order.* He is now nothing but a mere layman, and in so much a worse condition than other laymen, because the restitution of such an one to his office is a much more difficult thing than the promotion of other laymen.'"
 "It may perhaps be said, there was still an inherent power and authority in such deposed clerks, and that their deposition did not totally annul their ordinations: for they still retained the indelible character of their respective Orders: and therefore they might be ministers still, and their ministerial actions stand good and authentic, notwithstanding any power and authority in the Church to depose and degrade them. *But as this is NEXT TO A CONTRADICTION IN ITSELF, that a man should be deposed from his order and yet retain his order still,* with all the spiritual power belonging to it; so it implies such a notion of that which is commonly called the indelible character of ordination, *as no ancient writer ever thought of.* For the notion that the ancients had of the indelible character of ordination, was no more than they had of the indelible character of baptism: that as the outward form of baptism, washing or immersion in water, though but a transient act, served for ever to distinguish a Christian from a mere heathen or Jew; so as that, though he apostatized from the Christian faith into Judaism or Gentilism, he should still retain so much of the Christian character, as, upon his conversion and return to the faith, not to need a second baptism: in like manner the outward form of ordination, which is imposition of hands designing a man to any clerical office, though it be but a transient act, was sufficient to distinguish such an one from a mere layman, who never had any such ceremony of Ordination; so that by this mark or character of his office

once received, though he should afterward forfeit his office and all the power and honour belonging to it, he would always remain distinguished in some measure from those who never had such an office; and though he should be wholly divested of his office and power, and reduced to the simple capacity and condition of a layman, yet *so much of the marks and footsteps of his former office would remain upon him, as that if he should be recalled again to his office, though he might need a new commission, he would not need this outward character or ceremony of a new ordination.* There is no one [who] has explained or illustrated *the sense of the ancients* upon this point with more accuracy than the learned Dr. Forbes: and therefore, for further confirmation, I shall here transcribe his words: ‘There remains (says he) some distinguishing character in a man that is deposed, by which he is distinguished from other laymen; but to make this distinction, it is not necessary there should be *any form impressed*, but a transient act that is long ago past, is sufficient, viz., that he was once a person ordained. The character that remains in a deposed person, *is not the character of any present office or power*, but only some footstep or mark of an honour that is past, and of a power that he once had: by which footstep he is distinguished from other laymen, who never were ordained; and may, after a sufficient penance performed, if he be found fit, and the advantage of the Church so require, be restored again without a new Ordination.’” (Antiq. bk. xvii. c. 2. §§ 3—5. Works, vol. 6. pp. 350—354. ed. 1844.)

It is unnecessary to say, that there is nothing in the Canons of the French Church opposed to this, and that it leaves the doctrine which the Bishop seems desirous of inculcating entirely destitute of foundation.

One word in conclusion. If this matter were a mere theoretical question, or one of little practical import, I should not have thought it worth the space I have here devoted to it. But it is not so. The circumstances of the times demand more than ever the cordial intercommunion and mutual good-will of all who hold the true faith. Romanism is making a last effort to regain her lost dominion and reassume her empire over the nations of the earth. Her emissaries are everywhere, especially in the strongholds of Protestantism; spreading around us those corrupt principles by which she hopes to ensnare the unwary, and gradually draw them into her toils. Infidelity, as ever, is making the best use of the dissensions prevailing among the followers of Christ to cast reproach upon the Christian faith. How are these foes to be met?

We have been recently told, and told even from a quarter where such language is all but incomprehensible,—our own Episcopal Bench,—that the latter especially is to be met, and can only be successfully met, by urging upon our people the “*authority of our Church,*” and that the Episcopal Church, throughout Christendom,

is so completely the exclusive channel of all Divine grace to men, that all we can hope for other communions is, that it "may overflow its channels for their benefit."* To shew the total opposition of such sentiments to the principles of our Reformers, would be a work of supererogation; nor is this the place for it. But I point attention to these statements as shewing how deeply the poison has entered into the very soul of our Church, and is rankling in her heart's core.

These are the principles from which Popery took its rise. The substitution of the authority of the Church for the supremacy of Holy Scripture is the foundation-stone of Popery. Take it away, and the whole system crumbles to atoms. The authority of the Church is another phrase for the authority of the Apostolically-descended priesthood. The supremacy of this priesthood involves the committal into their hands of the interpretation of Holy Scripture and unlimited power over the consciences of mankind. And thus there arises a vast body of men, endowed since the fourth century with large possessions, to whose care religion is entrusted, upon whom mankind are to depend for a knowledge of the faith, and whose spiritual directions they are to follow at the peril of their salvation. Worldly-minded and ambitious men crowd into it to partake of its wealth and honours. Satan's emissaries make their way into its ranks in order to corrupt the true faith. Will "the grace of the Apostolical succession" keep such men out? or convert them when in? Facts prove the contrary. What reason have we to expect, that even the *majority* of such a priesthood will remain true to the pure faith of Christ? None. Much for a contrary expectation. And if they do not, what becomes of the faith of Christ? It is distorted by perverse interpretations of Holy Writ, overlaid with errors, and immersed in an ocean of corrupt rites and practices. The power of the priest being the corner-stone on which the system rests, the main object is to provide for its support. He becomes, therefore, all in all. He converts the feast of the commemoration of Christ's sacrifice into a real sacrifice, in which he is exhibited as possessing a superhuman power of changing the bread and wine into the real body and blood of Christ, and then offering them up again to the Father as the sinner's advocate. He claims a power even in the other world, of releasing from the pains of hell the soul of the sinner. He secures the salvation of all who will obey his directions. He is not, he will confess, divine; but divine power has been confided to him.

* See the Bishop of Oxford's recent Charge, pp. 38—42, and 81 et seq.

And how does the world receive all this? The priesthood find a large proportion of mankind prepared to admit every superstition and every perversion of the true faith, everything in short but real religion; the willing captives of a religion adapted to please the senses of human nature. And when universal dominion is thus placed in their hands, what reason is there to suppose they will not grasp it? They might be the envy of a Cæsar or an Alexander. For their prize is unbounded empire over the souls as well as bodies of mankind. Who can wonder, that a priesthood thus gifted should swell out into gigantic proportions, and that as its numbers and influence increase, its corruptions of the true faith increase in a proportionate ratio; that its pretensions and its errors go on multiplying with its years, until they reach the climax at which the measure of their iniquities is filled up, and the Divine forbearance reaches its limit! It soon becomes far too potent for any earthly power to cope with; its roots are spread throughout all lands, and its boughs extend to the ends of the earth; it is a vast upas tree, under whose poisonous influence the world must remain, until the hour—and it is a *promised* hour—when it “shall be consumed with the spirit of *His* mouth, and destroyed with the brightness of *His* coming.”

Such are the natural and necessary effects of setting up the authority of man in the place of that of God, man’s teaching in the room of God’s word. And if ever this principle regains its lost dominion in our Church, her relapse into Popery will speedily follow. In fact, her allowance of such a principle involves in itself her self-condemnation; for her doctrines are held by a very small minority of the apostolically-descended priesthood.

How, then, are we to meet the wiles of Popery, the assaults of Infidelity? By the united efforts of all who “hold the Head.” They who hold the true faith, and have been admitted by baptism among the followers of Christ, and are living as such, are undoubtedly members of His body. And *ubi tres, ibi ecclesia, licet laici*, said a Father of the second century. “Where two or three are gathered together in My name,” said our blessed Lord, “there am I in the midst of them to bless them.” And those to whom He is joined are beyond all doubt members of His Church.

True; He who is the God of order, and not of confusion, no doubt looks with disapprobation upon all unnecessary schisms and divisions in His Church, and therefore doubtless there are communities whom, though we recognise as brethren and as partakers of the Divine blessing in their labours, we believe to be involved in the sin of unnecessarily dividing the Christian Church, and

whose encouragement of strife and disorder among the followers of Christ we cannot aid in promoting; and still less give up our own Apostolical rule of government for theirs. But we see with thankfulness the Divine blessing resting upon their labours, we own them as brethren, and we say to any objector, "Enviest thou for our sakes? Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets." Nay, though circumstances necessarily prevent intercommunion in ministerial offices, there may still be somewhat of united effort in the cause of God. Nor must it be forgotten, that our Church may have given, in various ways, too much ground for such secessions from her communion.

To the Protestant Churches of other lands no such objection attaches. Alas! that the claims of those Churches upon the countenance and support of the more favoured Church of England have been so little regarded! How different might have been their present state, if our Church, *true to her first principles*, had held fraternal communion with them, counselling them as a friend, and throwing the shield of British protection over them when in adversity from the enmity of the bitter foes by which they have been from the first encompassed. But they have been left almost without a helping hand from us. And, so far as Europe is concerned, our efforts for the cause of the Reformed faith, which through the power and influence God has given us might have been spread throughout the whole Continent, have been confined to our own little Island; and even there in so imperfect a manner as to have left a large portion of our population destitute of even the ordinary means of grace.

What has been the result? Popery and Infidelity are lifting their heads and advancing with rapid strides. The cause of the true Reformed faith on the Continent is at the lowest ebb, and in the last stage of weakness and exhaustion. Popery already seems to see the reward of its long and persevering and insidious labours almost within its grasp.

How, then, is this state of things to be met? If we take the advice of the new school that have risen up among us, we are to wrap ourselves up in the dignity of an Apostolically-descended Episcopate, and repudiate all intercourse with any but those who can advance the same claim to the title of a Church. That is, we are to cast off all the Protestant Bodies that have not retained our form of church-government, as having no part or lot in the Church of Christ, as Bodies not entitled to our fraternal regard.

Is it too much to hope, that the earnest response of our Church will be, We have not so learned Christ ! that it will rise to the exigencies of the present crisis, and, casting off the trammels with which the agents of Popery among us would fain fetter its energies, will make common cause with all the genuine disciples of the true faith ; that no Diotrephes “ loving to have the pre-eminence,” who “ doth not himself receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would, and casteth them out of the Church,” will be suffered to stand in the way of that true Catholic communion which ought to exist among “ all those that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.” Grave as were the charges laid against some of the Seven Churches of Asia in the Apocalyptic Epistles to them, we find them still numbered, with all their imperfections, among the Churches of Christ. And shall we suppose, that a diversity in the form of government adopted is a greater sin than a corrupt state of faith and practice ?

Let our Church, then, gird herself to the conflict by rallying round her all the adherents of the genuine Reformed faith, and plant her standard with an unwavering hand on the rock of God’s word. Her ancient banner, the undivided supremacy of the Holy Scriptures, must be again unfurled ; and under it the contest must be waged. It may be too late to do much that might have been done at former periods. But there is still the opportunity left to make an effort for the cause of Protestant truth in Europe against the dangers by which it is encompassed.

Our country has much to answer for in the encouragement, direct and indirect, given by her to Popery both here and elsewhere. And she is now reaping the fruits of her suicidal policy, and beginning to feel the pressure of the iron yoke of Papal tyranny. May she be wise in time ; and learn the value of that Protestant faith to which, under God, she owes so many blessings ! May she exert the influence which God has given her, for the protection of that faith throughout the world ! The power that is used in the cause of God will receive a blessing that will re-act upon her own welfare. And above all, may she jealously guard that sacred deposit of truth committed by God’s mercy to her own keeping ; and never suffer the bloodbought inheritance of freedom from spiritual slavery, bequeathed to her by her “ noble army of martyrs,” to be snatched from her, either by treachery within, or open aggression from without.

APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

A REJOINDER

TO

CHANCELLOR HARINGTON'S

PAMPHLET, ENTITLED

“A FEW WORDS IN ANSWER TO THE REV. W. GOODE'S REPLY TO
ARCHDEACON CHURTON AND CHANCELLOR HARINGTON
ON THE LV. CANON,” ETC.

A REJOINDER TO CHANCELLOR HARINGTON'S

"A FEW WORDS," &c.

IN proceeding to make a few remarks on Chancellor Harington's Reply to my answer to his pamphlet on this subject, I must first express the pleasure I feel in having to deal with one who writes in a tone so different from that of the great majority of his party, whose chief weapons are inflated pretensions, misrepresentation, and abuse; and my desire to meet his statements in the same spirit. And I cannot but think, that he does himself an injustice in relying so much upon the statements of one whom he seems so anxious to quote as an authority. If he wishes to advance his cause, or carry conviction to dispassionate minds, his own straightforward statements will do him much better service.

I have said,* that the Chancellor, in giving extracts from Archbishop Bancroft's Sermon, "intended to shew the absurdity of supposing Bancroft to have recognised a Presbyterian community as a Church." The Chancellor intimates, that I ought to have said "The Kirk of Scotland," instead of "a Presbyterian community," and that the remark would then be true, "whatever might have been Bancroft's opinion of 'Presbyterian communities' in general." (p. 4.) This seems to me rather a nice distinction; and the Chancellor's own words, in introducing the quotations, are these:—"In order to ascertain this bishop's views on the Divine Institution of Episcopacy and the Ecclesiastical Polity of the Kirk, we have but to peruse his celebrated Sermon" (p. 19); and the extracts given attack it on account of its *form of government*.

But this is immaterial, because we have Archbishop Spotiswood's testimony (as I have before pointed out) that Bancroft did acknowledge the validity of the Scottish Orders in 1610. But Mr. Harington is still incredulous as to the truth of Spotiswood's relation; and he says, "The reader of Mr. Goode's Reply might

* Reply to Archd. Churton and Chanc. Harington, p. 15.

hastily infer, that Spotiswood was present when the discussion referred to took place," and proceeds to point out that we cannot be sure that he was present; and finally remarks that he prefers Heylin's account of the matter. Now, for "hasty" inferences from what I have written, I am not responsible; I have left the matter just as I found it. We cannot now tell whether he was present or not; nor from whom he had his information. But the case is this. Archbishop Spotiswood was one of the bishops consecrated in 1610, *respecting whom the question was discussed, whether their previous Ordination could be allowed.* He subsequently writes a History of the Church of Scotland, and is by universal consent an author of the highest repute for his gravity, care, and conscientiousness. And he tells us, as an unquestionable fact, and not any mere hear-say matter, that Bancroft said, that their Scottish Orders must be admitted, for that otherwise the Orders of all the Foreign Reformed Churches must be disallowed. The sole answer to this testimony is, that we do not know from whom he had his information, and that Heylin says, that Bancroft, when discussing the question as to their Orders, remarked, that consecration as a bishop would include the inferior Orders. Now, as to the first objection, I must again say, that we "may as well deny the value of almost all the records of history we possess" as reject Spotiswood's testimony on that ground; and as to the second, it is no *contradiction* (as I before pointed out, though Mr. Harington has not noticed it,) to Spotiswood's statement. Bancroft may very probably have made *both* statements; *and some of Mr. Harington's own authorities intimate that such was the case.*

And why should Heylin be preferred to Spotiswood? Mr. Harington says, that he "would naturally inform himself on the point in question." But would not Spotiswood be still more likely to do so in a matter where he himself was personally and so nearly concerned? And would he have made such a statement as an indubitable fact, if he had not had it on unquestionable authority? And is Heylin unlikely to have *omitted* such a statement? No one, I think, who knows his writings, will venture to affirm it.

But Mr. Harington adds, that Spotiswood "manifested considerable jealousy in favour of 'the Church of Scotland.' (See Bishop of Exeter's Letter, &c., p. 64.)" Now there must be some error in the reference here; for I can find nothing on the subject in the place quoted as an authority. And certainly there was no love on the part of Spotiswood for the Presbyterian Church of Scotland,

for he expressly says, in his Dedication of his History to King Charles,—“ For the Consistorial Discipline brought from Geneva some sixteen years after the Reformation, did men know the trouble raised thereby both in the Church and State, with the necessity that your Majesty’s Father of blessed memory was put to for reforming that confused government, they would never magnify nor cry it up as they do.”

And the passage I have already quoted in a previous page* from Burnet, shews that the English bishops who consecrated the Scottish bishops in 1661, admitted, that the Orders of those consecrated in 1610 were then allowed to be valid.

With these remarks I willingly leave this point in the hands of the reader.

To my remark in answer to Mr. Harington’s extracts from the Canons of 1606, that Archdeacon Mason and Bishop Cosin would both have assented to them, and yet held the validity of the Orders of certain Non-Episcopal Churches, the Chancellor replies, in effect, that the question is, whether they would have held the validity of the Orders of the “ Kirk of Scotland.” I leave it then to the reader to determine, whether the principles they have maintained in the passages of their works to which I have referred, do not apply to the Presbyterian Kirk of Scotland as well as to the Foreign Reformed Churches. And I cannot but think, that the Chancellor has some uncomfortable misgivings that the reader may think so, for he proceeds to attempt to prove, that the work of Archdeacon Mason, which I have referred to, is not genuine, and gives us an extract from the Preface of his translator Lyndsay to bear out this notion. But he has forgotten to shew, how he gets over the evidences I have given for its genuineness; evidences which, I may here observe, convinced one whose judgment I am sure Mr. Harington will think deserving of respect, the late Dr. Wordsworth, who, in a Letter to the Editor of the “ British Magazine,” occurring in the Number for Oct. 1842, p. 384, observes,—

“ As I not long ago referred to this tract as the genuine production of Mason (Christ. Inst. vol. iii. p. 258), perhaps you will permit me to state, that I did not do this without having examined the question *generally*, and without having considered, in *particular*, Lindsay’s arguments in his preface. I will not, however, trouble you with any argument in detail for regarding the work as really Mason’s, and for thinking Lindsay’s reasons not satisfactory. But perhaps you will kindly indulge me with room to invite W. A. H.’s attention,

* See p. 49 above.

and that of your readers, to an extract from 'A Letter from Mr. Samuel Ward to Mr. James Usher, afterwards Archbishop of Armagh.'"

And then, having given the passages I have quoted, he adds,—

"After a consideration of these two passages, I apprehend, Mr. Editor, that there will remain little doubt, that the tract in question did indeed constitute originally a portion of Mason's grand work; that it formed one of the main 'specialties omitted' and enquired after by Ward; being left out at the press, possibly from some prudential considerations; and that it continued in MS. till 1641, when it appeared in a collection of which there is good reason to believe that Usher, then Archbishop, was cognizant."

The genuineness of this work, then, being established, there arises this further argument bearing upon our present subject; that it turns out, that one whose writings are quoted as proofs that it would be *absurd* to suppose that he held the validity of Presbyterian Orders, did nevertheless maintain their validity in (to use Lyndsay's own words) "a professed disputation for the lawfulness of their calling." This is an important point in estimating the value of similar inferences from similar statements of other authors.

Mr. Harington next refers to Bishop Cosin's testimony, and pleads against its applicability to the Church of Scotland, because the Bishop says, that "nothing but a case of necessity" can excuse Presbyterian Ordinations, and that the Presbyterian Church of Scotland cannot plead such necessity, and in fact openly expressed its disapproval of the Episcopal Form of Government. (p. 9.)

Now as to "necessity," if the term is to be understood in its strictest sense, I doubt whether the Foreign Reformed Churches could be justified in Cosin's time on this ground; and yet we see that he pleaded for the validity of their Orders. And I suspect that Mr. Harington will find but few who will agree with him in drawing the distinction he attempts to make between the Scotch Kirk and the Foreign Presbyterian Reformed Churches. Nor can I think, that the abuse of Prelacy by the Scotch Presbyterians can make much difference in the abstract question of the validity of their Orders.

Mr. Harington, with the Bishop of Exeter, seems to think it rather strange and unreasonable that we should be called upon to pray for a Body as a Christian Church that abuses our form of church-government, and accounts it repugnant to the word of God. I cannot enter into such views. Their mistake in this respect does not lead me to wish to ignore their Christianity. The

Bishop of Exeter intimates, that he will not even pray for them "as a religious body," but only as "our enemies, persecutors, and slanderers." (Letter, pp. 61, 62, quoted by Mr. H., pp. 10, 11.) I will only wish for him a better state of mind.

Mr. Harington, proceeding to draw a distinction between the circumstances of the Foreign Reformed Churches and the Kirk of Scotland, to shew that what might be admitted in the case of the former was not admissible in that of the latter, says, "the only 'peculiar circumstance' attaching to the Kirk of Scotland in the 16th century was, that she was unhappily under the influence of some rabid Presbyterians termed 'Reformers,' &c." Now (not to notice the language in which the Reformation in Scotland is here spoken of, which I cannot but deeply regret) I would ask how it was that she was under such influence. Undeniably from the gross corruptions of her existing Episcopate, which exasperated the minds of the people against the whole order; and though two of the bishops did join the Reformed party, they were not such as to be made its heads and leaders. The question then is, whether, under such circumstances, the power of Ordination did not become vested in the pure portion of the Church, of whomsoever it might consist. And the views of our early writers on this question may, I think, be gathered without difficulty from the passages I have given from their writings. They clearly held, that each Church had a right to arrange its own affairs independently of any other, an intrinsic power of self-regulation. And their "case of necessity", justifying a departure from ordinary rules, was one not depending upon what aid any other Church might or might not be willing to render.

The difference between our modern followers of the Nonjurors (and Mr. Harington avows himself to be one, p. 31,) and our old divines, is, in few words, that the latter held that Non-Episcopal Ordinations were, under some circumstances, *valid* though *irregular*, and the former hold them to be absolutely *invalid*.

Mr. Harington proceeds (pp. 11—15) to vindicate his statement that the excommunication clause in Canons 7, 8, and 9 applies to the members of the Church of Scotland. I must refer the reader to what I before said on this subject, which I cannot think Mr. Harington has answered.

But I will add another illustration of my argument, which perhaps will commend itself more strongly to the Chancellor, and those who think with him. The clause in Canon 8 excommunicates all who say that the bishops, &c., made according to our Ordinal, are

not lawfully made, &c. Consequently, if Mr. Harington's interpretation of those Canons is right, the Church of Rome and all its members, not merely in this country, but *all over the world*, are excommunicated from the Church of Christ by this Canon, and cannot be recognised by us as any part of it, even a corrupt part. The Chancellor and his friends are not, I think, prepared to assert this.

The remarks which the Chancellor has here quoted from the Bishop of Exeter's "Letter to the Archdeacon of Totnes," I have already answered in my reply to the Bishop.

Mr. Harington next proceeds to Morrison's case; and the whole of his defence turns upon the question whether the First Book of Discipline was or was not enforced. I have stated that it was not enforced, not having the sanction of the law. Mr. Harington contends that it was, and that "Presbyterian Ordination was superseded in the Kirk for nearly a quarter of a century;" and adds several vague passages from different authors in aid of this view. Now I hope to convince Mr. Harington, by a very few references, that the case is clear against him.

"In this meeting," says Archbishop Spotiswood, speaking of an *Assembly of the Church* at Striveling in 1571, "the Churchmen began to think somewhat more seriously of the Policy of the Church than before; for the *first Draught* being *neither liked universally among themselves, nor approved by the Council*, they saw it *needful to agree upon a certain form of government that might continue*." (p. 258.)

So much for the general question as to the First Book of Discipline being enforced. And I may add here, that Lawson remarks, "The First Book of Discipline encountered a determined opposition." (Hist. p. 47.)

And now as to the particular question of Ordination. Archbishop Spotiswood, in the place just referred to, proceeds to say,— "Unto this time the Church had been governed by Superintendents and Commissioners of countries. . . . The Superintendents held their office during life, and their power was Episcopal, for they did elect and *ordain* ministers," &c. (p. 258.) And in January, 1572, at an Assembly of the Church at Leith, a Committee was appointed to draw up some resolutions on certain points of Church Polity, by whom the following among other resolutions were agreed to, namely, "That the ministers should *receive ordination* from the Bishop of the diocese, and where no Bishop was as yet placed, from the Superintendent of the bounds;" and, "That the Bishops and Superintendents, at *the ordination* of ministers, should exact of

them an oath," &c. And these resolutions were *received* by the General Assembly at their next meeting, in August, 1572, though exception was taken to some *other* points contained in them, and a protestation consequently made that it was only a *pro tempore* arrangement; which, however, does not affect the point in question.

This will, I hope, sufficiently clear to Mr. Harington's mind the phrase, "*juxta laudabilem Ecclesiæ Scotiæ reformatæ formam et ritum.*"

And lastly, at the (so-called) consecration of John Douglas as Archbishop of St. Andrews in 1571, the ceremony of laying on of hands, contrary to the directions of the First Book of Discipline, was used in the presence of John Knox himself, who preached the sermon, but refused to assist at the ceremony of consecration. (See, among others, Lawson, pp. 108, 109.)

The Chancellor proceeds to the case of Whittingham (pp. 19—24), but seems to me only to have obscured a very plain matter; the *facts* of which I have stated, so that any reader can judge for himself. The alteration which Mr. Harington proposes to make in the sentence to which I have objected, as implying that Whitgift issued a commission to report on Whittingham's Orders, would no doubt remove the objection; but as it stood, it was clearly open to it. That Whittingham's case is a favourite example with Presbyterian writers "in proof of the recognition by the Church of England of the validity of Ordination by presbyters," (p. 19), and a "prominent material" in defence of such a view, (p. 24,) does not affect my argument, because I have not quoted it as such; but then I wish Mr. Harington would recollect, that it is no proof *against* such recognition, as he still "claims" it to be; (p. 24;) because we find, on investigating the case, that he was not ordained in any regular Presbyterian Church, but by a few unauthorized individuals; and this was the charge made against him; namely,—as Strype (as quoted by Mr. Harington himself) states it,—his "being ordained by a few lay persons in a house at Geneva." This makes the case altogether irrelevant in itself; but so far as the account of Sandys's proceedings against him goes, it is, as I said before, "rather against Mr. Harington than in his favour," because it would seem likely, from Sandys's language, that he would have been satisfied if Whittingham had been regularly ordained in the Church of Geneva; and Mr. Harington admits, that this "may be

a matter for discussion." That Whitgift, in his remarks on the case, took a different view from Sandys's, I have already admitted.

I asked Mr. Harington, how it was, that, if his view of the meaning of the Preface to the Ordinal was correct, additional words were inserted on this point at the Restoration. He says, "My reply is obvious, viz., for the purpose of preventing the possibility of a doubt or cavil being raised by any subsequent Whittingham, or Travers, or Morrison, as to the views which the Church of England held on the necessity of Episcopal Ordination." This reply seems to me to concede all I want for my argument.

The Chancellor concludes his remarks on this question as to the meaning of the 55th Canon, by divers references to the statements of his great oracle, the Bishop of Exeter, in his "Letter to the Archdeacon of Totnes," whose *ipse dixi* he seems to think quite sufficient to settle this or any question; and he quotes, with "no slight degree of satisfaction," the Bishop's compendious reply to arguments shewing that the Kirk of Scotland is the Church referred to in the 55th Canon, that the notion "is too gross for an ordinary understanding to digest."

I cannot participate in, nay must regret, Mr. Harington's "satisfaction" in such a mode of argumentation, which forms a staple commodity in the Bishop's polemical treasury. I have a great dislike to an *ipse dixi* style in controversy, and believe it to be almost invariably the proof of a lack of sound arguments, and not least so when used by the Bishop of Exeter. If Mr. Harington thinks it of any use, let me assure him, that his own *ipse dixi* will be quite as valuable, in the eyes of his opponents, as that he has quoted, and much more so. There are at least some good qualities about it to give it a title to be heard. While the *ipse dixi* he has quoted, though it should mimic the thunders of the Vatican, or have the anathemas of its author against all dissentients appended to each sentence, would excite, at best, but a smile.

Mr. Harington tells me, that the question is not, as I have stated it to be, "What was the form of church-government in Scotland in 1604," and that the putting it in this form "obscures the subject to a very great extent;" but that it is, "What was the Church contemplated by the 55th Canon." (pp. 26, 27, *note*.) I must beg leave entirely to differ from this view. When we find the Church of Scotland mentioned in a Canon, and wish to know *what sort of Church* this was, as it respects its mode of govern-

ment, I think the obvious mode of determining such a question is by ascertaining what was *the actual state of things* in Scotland at the time as to the form of church-government in the only Church then existing there. To adopt Mr. Harington's plan of going about to ascertain what sort of Church the phrase referred to, by indirect reasonings and inferences from the supposed views of those that drew up the Canons, &c., when the question is one of *fact*, namely, what the actual state of the Church of Scotland was, appears to me to be equivalent to a voluntary mystification of ourselves. "The Church contemplated by the 55th Canon" was "the Church of Scotland;" and the question is, What was the form of church-government in that Church? Now there were not two visible Churches in Scotland at that time. And certainly there was no Episcopal Church, for there were no bishops, either as it respects *consecration* or even *office*.

Mr. Harington proceeds to reply to what I have said on his statements on the general question, that is, the admission of the validity of Presbyterian Orders by our Church; but instead of meeting my remarks, urges only that the view against which he was contending was different from mine. But he will, I hope, forgive me for saying, that he does not seem to me to speak with perfect self-consistency on this point. He says that his Catena, upon which I have animadverted, "was intended to disprove the position assumed [by those against whom he was writing], that the Anglican divines regarded Parity and Episcopacy as based on equal authority." Now if this had really been all that was intended, the case would have been one which I should have had no inclination to notice. But Mr. Harington must excuse me for referring him back to his Letter to refresh his memory on the subject.

He wrote thus. After observing, "I repeat that the Church of England has never, directly nor indirectly, recognised the validity of Presbyterian Ordination," he adds immediately, "And here the discussion might fairly close; but as the question is one of great moment, you will perhaps allow me to trespass on your columns, while I reiterate the views of the Church of England on this important question." Then come some quotations from the Ordinal, and then he adds, "Nothing of course could be easier than to quote abundant passages from the writings of the great luminaries of our Church in favour of the Divine right of Episco-

pany and the Apostolical Succession ;” and then follows the Catena. Of course the inference is, that the authors in this Catena are quoted as *not* “recognising the validity of Presbyterian Ordination ;” which, therefore, I have shewn to be a mistake as to the best of them.

Nay, in this very Reply he says, shortly after, —

“The question, the *res*, between me and my opponents was this, ‘Whether the Church Catholic has not, from the first to the nineteenth century, maintained the Divine Institution of Episcopacy, *recognising no other system of Church Polity* ? And whether the Church of England, as a portion of the Church Catholic, does not altogether exclude, and *has not always excluded* [Mr. Harington’s own italics,] ordination by Presbyters?’ My opponents referred to Euty chius, Morrison, Whittingham, the LVth Canon, &c., to disprove my position, and endeavoured to support their own *by the testimony of our divines.*”

And to those opponents Mr. Harington replied by general arguments and an opposing Catena. (pp. 29, 30.)

Surely, then, a Catena so brought forward was to be considered as one intended not *merely* to shew that our divines held “the Divine Institution of Episcopacy,” but that their views were with Mr. Harington on the general question. There was nothing in Mr. Harington’s language to imply such a *limitation* in the object of the Catena, but the contrary. As such then I treated it, and as such I argued against it. And I must suppose, from Mr. Harington’s not attempting to vindicate it against my remarks, that he is aware that, *viewed in that light*, it will not stand investigation.

It may be very true, that the writers in the *Herald* did not admit as much as I am prepared to admit on the point ; but that does not affect the question between Mr. Harington and myself. He says, the writers in the *Herald* “regarded Ordinations by presbyters as equally ‘regular’ and equally ‘admissible’ [as Ordinations by bishops.] Against this position my Catena was directed, as enlarged in my late pamphlet ; and I contend that it is precisely *ad rem.*” (p. 29.) Now I think I have shewn from Mr. Harington’s own language, that the Catena, at any rate as it appears in his pamphlet, was directed against *much more than* “this position,” namely, against the general question of the *validity* of Presbyterian Ordinations ; and *so far* it was not, I contend, *ad rem*, because any one may hold, like Mason, &c., the Divine Institution of Episcopacy, and at the same time hold the validity of certain Presbyterian Ordinations.

And though Mr. Harington professes not to have had in view the subject of the Archbishop's letter to Mr. Gawthorn, yet what he states to have been the great question between him and his opponents, was in fact the great question involved in the Archbishop's letter.

And when Mr. Harington boldly avows (pp. 30, 31) his agreement with those whom Archbishop Wake designated as "*furiosi scriptores*," on account of their sentiments on the subject of the Ordinations of the Foreign Reformed Churches, he must be conscious, that he is maintaining a view opposed to that taken by the immense majority of our great divines of olden time. He proclaims himself a follower of "Brett, Leslie, Dodwell, and Hickes," the Nonjurors, in denying that even any case of necessity can justify or make valid Presbyterian Ordinations.

Having thus noticed all the points of Mr. Harington's Reply, I cordially adopt his concluding words, and "cheerfully leave" the whole matter "to the 'candid reader' (if such there be), with the understanding, however, that he will prove his candour by *fairly* reading *both sides* of the question."

SUPPLEMENT.

SUPPLEMENT.

I. ANSWER TO REV. W. R. SCOTT'S REPLY.

IN putting forth a Third Edition of the preceding Tract, it may be well to avail myself of the opportunity it affords me to make a few remarks on a vehement attack upon it by the Rev. W. R. Scott,* which its author calls "a Reply," but which does little more than re-state in more feeble language the arguments which have been already answered, and misrepresent the statements it professes to refute. Mr. Scott, like many of his friends, appears to suppose that he has nothing to do but to go over the usual commonplaces of the Tractarian party (to which he avows himself to belong, p. 63), with the customary self-complacency with which they parade them before the public as indisputable truths, after being refuted a hundred times over, and then draw the conclusion, See how opposed Mr. Goode's cause is to the truth. That this has its effect with a certain portion of the public, and especially of the younger clergy, whose feelings are gratified by the dignity conferred upon them by the doctrines defended by Mr. Scott, and who have not sufficient knowledge of the subject to see through their unsoundness, is doubtless very true; and such authors will find themselves cheered on with abundant acclamations by their party as very useful auxiliaries in helping on their cause. But Mr. Scott must excuse my saying, that as I write for those who are in search of the truth, and willing to take the trouble of ascertaining the weight and value of the arguments and authorities advanced, I am quite content, so far as concerns a great part of Mr. Scott's pamphlet, to refer my readers to what I have already written upon the subject.

My answer to Mr. Scott's "Reply," therefore, will be very brief.

He commences by informing his readers that the parties he is opposing "have conceived it a duty to surrender now the doctrines, now the mission, now the very name of our 'Catholic Church,' " to the Church of Rome. (p. 1.)

This is certainly a very serious charge; but Mr. Scott having forgotten to prove it, the public will probably thank me for delaying my answer till he has done so.

To prevent misunderstanding, I stated (p. 1) that the doctrine I was opposing was this,—“That the only legitimate and promised channel through which the grace of God comes to mankind, is a ministry deriving its Orders from an Apostolically-descended Episcopate;” avoiding the use of the ambiguous phrase, “Apostolical succession,” because there

* Apostolical Succession and Canon LV. A Reply to Rev. W. Goode's Tract, &c. Lond. Masters.

is a true doctrine of Apostolical succession as well as a false one; and the false or Tractarian one, which is the doctrine I have stated, was that which I was opposing. But such ambiguous phrases form the best weapons in the armoury of the Tractarian. Without them he would be utterly powerless in his attempt to prove his doctrines to be those of our Church. And consequently the first thing Mr. Scott does in meeting my argument is actually to substitute, when quoting from my Tract, this ambiguous phrase *in the place* of my definition of the doctrine opposed.

Professing to reply to my statements, he quotes my words until he comes to those I have just cited, and then deliberately *substitutes for them* the ambiguous phrase "Apostolical succession;" and having thus put words into my mouth conveying a sense to which he knows me to be opposed,* he proceeds to his argument. And it is curious to see the Babel of confusion in which this disingenuous artifice has involved him. For he first says, that I have rejected the doctrine of Apostolical succession, and then intimates that the doctrine I have opposed is not the true doctrine of Apostolical succession; thus contradicting himself.

But he is quite right in saying that the doctrine I have opposed is not the true doctrine of Apostolical succession, though wrong in denying that it is what the Tractarians hold as the doctrine of Apostolical succession. I hold what I consider the true doctrine of Apostolical succession, as he knows; but reject the false one; and therefore I stated in precise terms the doctrine I opposed, in order to render nugatory the Tractarian device of quoting our old authors as supporting their views because they have used terms to which the Tractarians affix their own meaning. Consequently this misrepresentation renders Mr. Scott's whole argument on the subject irrelevant.

And these few remarks will, I hope, enable him to see the value of his very curious note of justification for having deliberately misquoted me as saying what I have not said.

Before proceeding to his task of refuting my statements, Mr. Scott tells us how each individual is to learn the truth. And the method is this:—"That while Scripture is the fountain of all truth, each individual is *not to draw for himself*;—not to take and reject—to fight over and sully those living waters as he chooses, but *is to receive them IN FAITH FROM THE CHURCH*;" for our Articles say, that "the Church hath authority in controversies of faith," and "that authority," says Mr. Scott, "is the authority of the whole Church from Christ until now." (p. 3.)

This passage may shew the reader the ground which Mr. Scott occupies, and for that purpose only I have quoted it; as I have long ago given, in my "Divine Rule of Faith and Practice," an ample answer to all such statements. And I shall stop only for one moment earnestly to urge Mr. Scott to take heed how he ventures to trust his steps upon such mere moonshine as the notion contained in these words. These words, to say nothing of their opposition to the doctrine of our Church, when they come to be practically applied by a man seriously endeavouring to find the truth in accordance with their directions, will be found (as Mr. Newman will tell him) *vox et præterea nihil*. And the end to which such

* See my Reply to Churton and Harington, pp. 29, 30, which Mr. Scott himself has quoted pp. 53 and 56.

notions directly tend, as has now been abundantly proved from the case of Mr. Newman downwards, is Romanism. For, directly a man begins seriously to inquire into the matter, he finds, that to ascertain what doctrines have "the authority of the whole Church from Christ until now," is, to say the least, the work of a long life; and, to speak more correctly, is an impossibility to any man; and then, having placed his faith upon the word of man instead of that of God, he finds himself almost unconsciously landed in the Romish system as the only consistent and intelligible scheme by which his views can be carried out. And here, I believe, is to be found a very sufficient reason, and perhaps the true reason, why so many sincere inquirers after the truth have been permitted to go astray and embrace serious error. They have put man's word in the place of God's, and man's teaching in the place of that of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Scriptures are made to give place to "the Church" (which it would puzzle a Tractarian to define so that any one could know how to be *taught by it*); and the teaching of the Holy Spirit, as it respects individuals, is virtually altogether repudiated. And when men have thus given up God's teaching for man's, it is but a just judgment if they are left to reap the suitable fruits of such a choice.

In fact, I cannot but regard such a notion as one of the appropriate fruits of that rationalistic and sensuous spirit so natural to man, and of which we see the effects in so many different ways in the present day. The word of God being interpreted by men in different senses, (and no one ought to feel surprised that such is the case even in its plainest and most obvious declarations), the rationalizing spirit of man, forgetting the spiritual nature of Christ's kingdom, and that all Christ's true followers are taught the truth savingly, not by human but Divine influence, immediately cries out, Oh! then, we must find some unerring earthly guide who can tell us which is the true sense. This is the first step in error; and if not retraced, will certainly lead to many more on the same road. Some perhaps may all their lifetime stop short at the dreamy region of "Catholic consent," unanimous patristic interpretation, and conciliar decrees, which to uninquiring and superficial minds may appear very inviting and satisfactory. While others, not so easily satisfied with putting *words* in the place of *things*, will assuredly pass on to something more real and substantial, and will find no rest for the sole of their feet until they have reached Romanism. And Mr. Scott—who, in the first Advertisement of his Reply to me, described himself as a "Catholic priest,"—will, I hope, excuse me for saying that his Pamphlet bears very strong indications that his course is at present rapidly tending in that direction.

Mr. Scott commences with restating the worn-out arguments derived from the Ordinal. I beg to remind him that I have already answered them, and I refer the reader to my answer. (p. 17, et s. above.) And to say nothing of his citation from Dr. Nicholls (p. 7.), which is palpably *opposed* to the view in support of which he cites it, I will leave the reader to judge what answer an author deserves, who, in the face of the notorious fact, that certain words were not introduced into the Ordinal till more than a century after its promulgation by the Reformers,—a fact distinctly brought under his notice in the Tract to which he professes to reply,—coolly argues upon these words (pp. 8, 9.) as if they had been introduced by the Reformers, and then pours forth censures upon his opponent grounded upon this false notion.

Time is too precious to be wasted upon analyzing the statements of

one who writes in this fashion. And the same vein of untruthfulness runs throughout the whole pamphlet. Phrases applied by me to one thing are unscrupulously alleged as applied by me to points totally different; as for instance, repeatedly, the phrase "veriest tyro;" and charges are constantly made, having not the slightest foundation to rest upon, as respecting my view of an Act of Parliament, (p. 9.) &c. &c.; but to go through such cases would be as wearisome as it would be useless. Any reader in search of truth will see at once, on a comparison of the two Tracts, the justice of this remark.

Mr. Scott proceeds to the 23rd Article, and seems not to have a notion even of the argument he had got to answer. All agree that there ought to be an *internal* call to the ministry from God, but differ on the point whether the *outward* call must be from one specially commissioned by God to give it, and so from God also. Now the Article speaks only of the outward call, and does not require this special commission. But the Bishop of Exeter had represented the Article as saying that the outward call was from God, and so by men specially commissioned by him to give it; which is just what it studiously avoids saying. This, therefore, was pointed out; and also that his own referee, Bishop Pearson, had spoken of the call *quatenus a Deo* as internal. Mr. Scott wastes two pages (10, 11.) in talking about there being a twofold call, and that the outward implies the inward (which, of course, it does), but does not touch the real point in question. His dealing with Pearson I leave to the reader.

Of his admiration (p. 12.) of the "tone of the Bishop of Exeter's publications," I leave him in undisturbed possession.

The charges of all kinds hurled by the Bishop of Exeter against some of the highest in the land, including his own Metropolitan, to whom he has vowed canonical obedience and respect, are quite consistent, in Mr. Scott's view, with right feeling and propriety. But to speak of such conduct in terms of reprobation, is quite the contrary. Thus thinks Mr. Scott, and such no doubt is the view entertained by his party, for their practice evinces it.

My remarks upon the Bishop of Exeter's comment on the word "preach," in the Article, and my references to Scripture and antiquity to shew that it was groundless, I am content to leave to be compared with Mr. Scott's attempted reply to them. And I will venture to think that the reader will consider that I have somewhat better grounds for objecting to the Bishop's statement, than because "the Bible is summarily rejected" by me. And I must be excused from analyzing remarks extending over five pages, the object of which is to explain away some very plain statements of Holy Scripture, and the refutation of which would take up three times as many, while none who are inclined to see the truth need any.

The cream of the argument is this, that the persons I referred to as "preaching" without ordination, were not preaching, but only λαλουντες, "talking of" or "reciting" the word, and ευαγγελιζομενοι, "mentioning the glad tidings," while those ordained were κηρυσσοντες, preaching or proclaiming the word *with authority*. Does Mr. Scott expect such arguments to be seriously discussed? If he does, let him consult his Greek Testament, in Mark i. 45, v. 20, vii. 36; Luke viii. 39; where he will find the poor men that our Lord healed κηρυσσοντες what he had done for them.

And according to his usual custom, he, in the face of a sentence

stating that I was not then "touching the question" "of what Apostolical practice teaches us to be proper for the due appointment of a preacher of the Gospel in a regularly constituted Church," (p. 9 above) charges me with adducing the passages as evidence on this very point. (p. 17.)

Mr. Scott's objection (pp. 18—20.) to my reply to the Bishop of Exeter's argument against the Foreign Reformed Churches that our Articles require the Sacraments to be "duly ministered," which the Bishop asserts can only be "by those who have commission and authority from God given to them for that purpose," fails on this account, that the statement in the Article *does* refer to the question of *valid* ministration, because the words are, that "the Sacraments be duly ministered in all those things that *of necessity are requisite* to the same." The doctrine therefore which Mr. Scott has discussed, that a baptism may be valid which is irregularly administered, is actually opposed to his own cause. And my argument stands perfectly untouched, that the Bishop is refuted by the fact that our Church admits the validity of even lay-baptism; and consequently his Lordship has misapplied the Article.

Mr. Scott's whole argumentation therefore again falls to the ground, from his not seeing the argument he had to answer.

Mr. Scott's doubts, whether our Church does hold the validity of lay-baptism, I must leave him to set at rest by obtaining further information on the subject, as it would be a waste of time now to discuss such a question. And I must beg him to remember, that an undisputed judgment of the Court of Arches (though I do not rest on that alone) stands upon a very different footing from one that has been thoroughly overturned by a judgment of a Court of Appeal sanctioned by both the Primates.

I trust, therefore, that Mr. Goode's "fabric" is something rather more stable than to "crumble at a touch," (p. 22.) and that he need not feel much alarm at Mr. Scott's threat of the anger of "the people" for not sufficiently exalting his office. I cannot but think that their anger is much more likely to fall on those who, while professing to hold the doctrines of a Protestant Church, are in fact undermining them, and preparing the way for the restoration of Popery.

Mr. Scott proceeds to the form for absolution in the Visitation of the Sick, on which he says comment would be idle, but devotes a page to it. His comment is certainly as "idle" as it is possible to conceive, for he assumes all the points he had got to prove. That form speaks of our Lord Jesus Christ having left power *to his Church* to absolve; upon which Mr. Scott comments thus: "How does the Church exercise the power? By 'committing authority' to me, a priest." And this authority was committed to him by a Bishop at his ordination; and so all is proved. And presbyters cannot "commit" that power, because they are not successors of the Apostles.

That is to say, Mr. Scott supposes he *proves* everything by simply making these declaratory statements. My only reply to him is, to advise him to read the extracts I have given from our learned Dean Field, in pp. 31—34 above; and also from the High-Churchman Hadrian Saravia, in my first Tract on this subject, pp. 21, 22, and from Bishop Cosin, pp. 39—41.

His argument from the Ordinal (p. 24) is of a similar kind. It is briefly this. In our Church the commission for the office of Bishop,

Priest, and Deacon is given in a certain way, and in that way only. Therefore it cannot be given in any other Church, though its circumstances may be wholly different, in any other way. Again I refer him to Dean Field, Saravia, and Bishop Cosin.

Mr. Scott characteristically adds, that "the principle of Apostolical succession," "Mr. Goode contemptuously rejects." That is, having deliberately garbled my statement of what I was opposing, by substituting the ambiguous phrase "the doctrine of Apostolical succession," for my express definition of the error I was writing against, he charges me with contemptuously rejecting that which he knows* that in its right sense I receive.

The extracts that follow from Dean Comber, Bishop Horsley, and Dr. Nicholls, are totally insufficient to prove the invalidity of the Orders of the Foreign Reformed Churches; and therefore I pass them over without remark.

The reference that follows to the article in the Creed, "I believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church," as proving that the whole Church must be under one form of ministry, I leave to its fate; while I can assure Mr. Scott, that far from believing that article to "mean nothing," I believe it to mean a great deal; namely, belief in the existence of the *true* Church of Christ, which is an object of faith just so far as it is *not* an object of sight. It is belief in the existence of a remnant that have not bowed the knee to Baal.

Both S. Gregory and our own learned Bishop Morton (to mention no more) will tell him what the Catholic Church is, as an article of Christian belief. (Morton's Prot. Appeal, i. 5. 2.)

And as it respects Mr. Scott's quotations in general from our divines on the subject, I would particularly beg the reader to observe, that while I have carefully limited myself almost wholly, in my three Tracts on this subject, to extracts from our divines bearing *directly and expressly on the point in question*, which is an *exceptional* case, my opponents have given scarcely any that even profess to touch it; and have quoted as in their favour, on account of certain vague and general statements, various authors who have *expressly opposed their views*.

Mr. Scott's whole Catena from our divines (pp. 30—48) labours under this fatal defect, that his extracts do not touch the point in question. And the reference to Bishop Hall (to cite no other) is alone sufficient to shew its worthlessness, for none have spoken more strongly than he has upon the *general* claims of Episcopacy, except perhaps Laud, to whom Mr. Scott is quite welcome; and yet (as I have shewn, pp. 56, 57, above, and also in the first Tract, p. 35.) he entirely repudiates Mr. Scott's doctrine. The same might be shewn of Bishop Taylor and others whom he quotes, if it were necessary.

And Mr. Scott is far more blameworthy in this than others, because he had before him the proofs that certain whom he quotes as in his favour held an entirely opposite view. Thus he claims even Archbishops Whitgift and Bancroft, and even Bishop Cosin, (whom, like the Bishop of Exeter, he calls Cosins,) to say nothing of Hooker (upon whom, by the way, Mr. Scott has conferred a Doctor's degree), who expressly defends even Beza's Orders. I confess that I am utterly unable to reconcile these things with a love of truth.

Again, Mr. Scott, *utterly ignoring the testimonies I produced from*

* See my Reply to Churton and Harington, pp. 29, 30, with the reference in the note. This Reply is quoted by Mr. Scott, pp. 53 and 56.

the greatest divines of Queen Elizabeth's reign (when our Formularies were settled), in the Tract on which the Bishop of Exeter commented, directs attention to my remark that the Bishop had only ventured even to *claim* Hooker and Bilson during this period, (Hooker, as I have shewn, being most erroneously claimed, and in all probability Bilson also); and without noticing my refutation of the claim, meets the remark (pp. 41, 42.) by intimating, that there was "no opposition to their teaching;" that the rest were *silent* or *indifferent*, and therefore the testimony of these two is quite enough; adding some depreciatory remarks about Coverdale, Grindal, and Pilkington, which only damage his own cause, because these were men of high repute in their age. Does Mr. Scott suppose, that, in the case of those who read for the discovery of truth, anything but disgrace to himself can accrue from such a mode of dealing with the subject.

And here another proof occurs of the recklessness of his statements. He says, (p. 44,) "Mr. Goode's friends are in the habit of renouncing the word 'Catholic,' and assigning it exclusively to those of the Roman Church." With as much truth and decency Mr. Scott might have accused them of abandoning the word *Christian* to those of the Roman Church.

As to my assertion of the (what is called) "Calvinistic" doctrine of our divines of Queen Elizabeth's reign in my work on Baptism, to which Mr. Scott refers, p. 47, (and, by the way, confounds it with what has nothing to do with it, Genevan *discipline*,) it is, as I have there shewn, nothing more than what *one of the best writers on Mr. Scott's own side* elaborately maintained in the "British Critic;" and I am perfectly willing to leave the reader to compare my arguments and authorities on the subject in that work with what Mr. Scott considers, as a matter of course, like all his party, but nobody else, Archdeacon Wilberforce's "masterly exposure" of my "delusion," which he complains that I have not answered, nor Archbishop Lawrence's Bampton Lectures. Why I should be expected to answer Archbishop Lawrence's Bampton Lectures, I know not. I doubt whether the public take sufficient interest in them now to make it of any importance to do so. And as to Archdeacon Wilberforce's work, I had the best reason for thinking it to be wholly unnecessary to publish a formal reply to it; and my noticing it depends upon my having time and opportunity to publish either another edition, or a supplement to my work, which is the sole reason why I now notice Mr. Scott's pamphlet.

Mr. Scott terminates his appeal to his Catena (p. 49.) with a reiteration of the deliberate misstatement upon which he has grounded his whole argument, that I have spoken of the doctrine of "Apostolical succession" as a "grievous error." And here, as well as throughout his whole pamphlet, applies my words "lately put forth," as meaning that the error I was speaking of had never been broached before, though my statement to a *precisely contrary effect* was at the time staring him in the face.*

And the whole catena of testimonies which I have brought from the divines of our Church, from the period of the Reformation, including such men as Bishop Cooper, Archbishop Whitgift, Archdeacon Mason, Dean Field, and Bishop Cosin, is coolly dismissed with the remark, that it proves no more than that "there were persons nominally

* Reply to Bishop of Exeter, p. 45. Also, Reply to Churton and Harington, p. 25.

within the Church who did not hold the doctrine of the Church," that is, Mr. Scott's doctrine. (p. 48.)

"Had the Church her legislature," exclaims Mr. Scott, "she could pass a declaratory act of what her doctrine was." (p. 48.) Precisely so: this is the reason of the clamour for Convocation. Among other objects to be accomplished by it, would be a sentence of excommunication from the Church of Christ of all Churches and religious communities not governed by an Apostolically derived Episcopate. And the love of truth, the amount of information, the respect for constituted authorities,* and the general spirit in which its proceedings would be conducted by a portion of its members, are very clearly shadowed forth in the pamphlets, newspapers, and magazines of Mr. Scott's party.

But till this happy consummation, Mr. Scott thinks our only way of settling the matter is by an appeal to the "consentient testimony" of the Fathers. (p. 48.) And accordingly he favours us with a Catena from certain of the Fathers, containing the testimonies usually cited from them in favour of Episcopacy, and then supposes that he has proved, as far as the "consentient testimony" of the Fathers is concerned, *the indispensable necessity* of an Apostolically-derived Episcopate to the existence of a Church.

Of course the reply is, not merely that he cannot get sufficient testimony on the point for his purpose, but that the Fathers he quotes were speaking of a state of things quite different from that of the Reformed Churches of the Continent. Again, I refer him to the authors I have already quoted, after whom it is unnecessary for me to add a word.

Mr. Scott proceeds to the argument respecting the 55th Canon, and treats it most characteristically, multiplying words on anything rather than the point in question. The whole matter may be made to lie in a nutshell. Was there an Apostolically-derived Episcopate in Scotland when that Canon passed? The fact that there was not, is undeniable. But for the convenience of the Civil Government certain persons were, as I before pointed out, called Bishops, and had certain temporal privileges secured to them by Parliament, but were in fact subject in ecclesiastical matters to their presbyteries and the General Assembly. So that they had neither the requisite consecration nor the office of bishops. Such a Church, therefore, was clearly Presbyterian. The titular Episcopate was but a name. And so the High-Churchman Mr. Lawson expressly maintains, as I have before shewn;† and in the same place I have pointed out fully the circumstances of the case; so that Mr. Scott has not even the plea of want of information to defend himself with.

Now, how does he deal with this matter? He first multiplies quotations, in which these sham bishops are spoken of as real bishops, and then (though one of his own quotations drops the phrase, which I suppose he forgot to cut out, that they "*possessed no ecclesiastical jurisdiction or pre-eminence,*") asks, "Is it credible, that in the teeth of these historical statements Mr. Goode can persist in maintaining that there were no bishops in Scotland in the years 1603-4?" (p. 56.)

And the reader will observe, besides the attempt here made to mislead the reader, the enormous inconsistency of one who, after spending nearly a whole pamphlet upon an endeavour to prove that an Apostoli-

* "The fact is," says Mr. Scott, "there are so many Archbishops and venerable fathers more ignorant than the 'veriest tyro,' that the tyros might give lessons to the fathers in 'primitive spirit,' 'judgment,' and 'penetration.'" (p. 38.)

† Reply to Churton and Harington. (p. 7.)

cally-derived Episcopate is necessary even to the existence of a Christian ministry and a Church, and that Orders derived from any other source are null, turns round upon himself when he finds it convenient to do so, and defends the claims of men to the Episcopate who, according to his own theory, were altogether destitute of holy orders of any kind, and inveighs against an opponent for denying the name of a true Episcopal Church to those who were ecclesiastically connected with such persons!

Deeply painful, however, as it is to contemplate such statements as these, the succeeding sentence leaves even the former behind it in all its worst characteristics. "But," says Mr. Scott, "when Mr. Goode is confuted on this point, viz., that 'there were no bishops and no Episcopal form of Church-government' [the reader will recollect I was speaking of the time when the Canon was passed] while repeating it, he also changes his ground [so that I changed my ground in consequence of my statement being confuted in the very letter in which that statement occurred, when no one had had the opportunity of confuting it, for the reference is to one and the same letter] and says, '*I meant, that though there were bishops, they were dead! No, I meant they were only "titular bishops," and that the Church was then under a Presbyterian form of Church-government, and it is so now.*' Reply to Archdeacon Churton, &c., p. 10." (p. 56.)

Astounding as it may seem that a person in Mr. Scott's position should be guilty of such a representation, the words in italics are actually given by Mr. Scott, within inverted commas, as a quotation from me. I leave the reader who wishes to know the degree of credibility due to Mr. Scott's statements to compare the passage with my pamphlet. I will not offer one word of comment upon it; and I can assure Mr. Scott that it is without one particle of anger, but with deep sorrow, that I view such emanations from his pen, because I know what must be in store for our Church under such teachers.

His quotation from Camden, &c. is perfectly useless in the face of the authorities I have given on the subject; and his reference to Laud's maintenance of the Canon in 1640 is irrelevant, because Laud maintained it with regard to the Church of Scotland as it then stood, and it was then Episcopal.

With the exposure of one more case of bold and direct misrepresentation (which is, in fact, the sole remaining matter requiring notice in the pamphlet), I shall close my review of Mr. Scott's Reply.

In quoting from Morinus as to the views of some of the Scholastical divines, I observed, that he "notices the custom that prevailed *for many years* at Alexandria, 'Presbyteros Alexandrinos mortuo Episcopo suo unum ex Ordine et gremio Ecclesiæ suæ elegerit, thronoque excelsiori collocasse et Episcopum appellasse;' to whom, of course, when placed in that office, though without any fresh ordination or consecration, the duty of ordination belonged." (p. 30)

This was a simple statement of *fact*, no more open to question than if I had said that Morinus wrote a treatise "De sacris ordinationibus." Mr. Scott, presuming, I suppose, upon the want of acquaintance of nine-tenths of his readers with the work of Morinus, after a coarse personal remark which I leave unnoticed, blushes not to say,—“Not only did Morinus not give a shadow of ground for such a statement, but he actually does say of the African custom, 'the Bishop elect, who comes for consecration, is to kneel before the altar, the Gospels are laid over

his head, and he receives imposition of hands from the consecrating bishop.” (pp. 60, 61.)

That is, although Morinus not only states precisely what I have mentioned, but in other passages near it expressly adds that the rites Mr. Scott refers to were not used, at the time spoken of, in constituting the Bishop of Alexandria (See Morin. Pt. iii. p. 16 and 122*), he scruples not to put forth a reckless denial of this plain fact, and to quote a passage (for which, by the way, he gives no reference,) *written with respect to a totally different period* as if it spoke of the period in question!

He then goes on to tell his readers what Morinus says of the custom of the Greek Church in the matter of Ordination, and adds,—“ Yet Mr. Goode coolly says, that the ‘evidence of Morinus establishes the fact, that a presbyter needs no fresh ordination to enable him to confer orders:’ ” (p. 61.) my words being, “ Consequently, *on this view of the matter*, [that is, the view entertained by some of the Scholastic writers, and the Alexandrian custom] a presbyter needs no fresh ordination to enable him to confer orders;” which is a *simple fact*; and was adduced for the purpose of shewing there was *some* evidence in antiquity against the exclusive view of the Bishop of Exeter; while the sentence deliberately stated by Mr. Scott to be mine, puts into my mouth a statement of a totally different character.

The remark of Jerome which I am then blamed for not quoting, has nothing to do with the matter, which is a mere question of fact. And because I merely added that *Morinus* cites the author of “*Quæstiones Vet. et Nov. Test.*” on the same point, (Morinus being, I humbly take leave to think, as well able to judge of the propriety of such a citation as Mr. Scott,) Mr. Scott runs off into a philippic about the heresy of this author, and speaks of him as one “*to whom Mr. Goode so implicitly defers*,” and that by me “modern heretics are canonized as Apostolic Fathers.”

What effect does Mr. Scott suppose that all these statements can have, in the case of all those whose good opinion is worth possessing, but that of bringing disgrace upon himself?

On Mr. Scott’s closing remarks I do not feel it necessary or desirable to offer many words. I shall content myself with pointing out to the reader a few of the flowers with which they are strewed.

In the face of direct evidence (as I have shewn) to the contrary, he informs his readers that I have stated his doctrine to be “a novel one, invented of late by Tractarians.” (p. 62.)

In the face of the numerous testimonies I have given from many of our best divines directly opposing his doctrine, he speaks of it as a doctrine “*taught at all times, by all men, everywhere, in Catholic Christendom from Christ till now.*” (p. 63.)

He informs his readers that “the fruit of the system of which Mr. Goode is the present representative, is plainly seen. A gradual abandonment of Catholic Truth and Discipline” . . &c. &c. . . “congregations” “sitting and lolling through a dreary service ‘performed’ once a Sunday, sometimes once a month; *diversified with wild harangues, calculated only to mystify or excite*,” &c. &c. (p. 63.)

* The words in the latter passage are,—*Ex eo colligitur evidenter ducentis saltem post Alexandrum annis Presbyteros Alexandrinos, non Episcopos, Patriarcham elegisse: nec Presbyteros nec Episcopos nec quosvis alios manum electo imposuisse.*

And then, after giving the description that might be expected from him of the effects of "the Catholic system," he observes,—“This is the work Mr. Goode would stay; the fruit he would wither with a scoff; this the system he would EXCHANGE FOR APATHY OR FANATIC PRIDE.” (pp. 63, 64.)

Of course no well-informed reader, on either side of the question, will look for an answer to outbreaks such as these. The reason why I quote them is, that they shew more forcibly than any remark I could make, both the amount of information and the spirit which have guided Mr. Scott's pen in the composition of his pamphlet.

Mr. Scott tells us, that "the fruits of the Catholic system" have been, among other things, "the culture of a pure morality." (p. 63.) Let me remind him that a "pure morality" is known by its fruits, and one of the principal of these is a love of truth. "The morality of Tractarianism" has been fully set before the public by one best able to judge of it, and the representation of it there given will not, I suspect, be soon forgotten. In fact, when men are openly perverting a Prayer Book compiled by such men as Parker, Grindal, and others of like mind, to Popish doctrines and practices, solemnly declaring their acceptance of the Royal Supremacy for the purpose of gaining a footing in our Church, while it is notorious that they deny it as laid down in the Canons, their boast of being the teachers of a "pure morality" is one which they may rest assured will be of little service to them with that portion of the English public whose good opinion is worth having.

Mr. Scott wonders how it is, that ministers of our Church should desire to repudiate such notions as he entertains of their authority. I will endeavour to explain the phenomenon to him. It is because we believe that such a repudiation is required by the claims of truth. It is because we believe that such notions are as offensive in the sight of God as they are repugnant to the reason and the feelings of man. It is because we view with pain, and more than pain, the just alienation of the affections of sober-minded men from our Church, when they see a host of young "priests" puffed up with notions of their own authority over God's heritage, which are as much opposed to the doctrine of our Church as unwarranted by Holy Scripture, and interposing themselves between the people and the Divine Sources of knowledge and grace,—the Holy Scriptures and the Saviour,—as the sole appointed dispensers of both. It is because we believe that it was for no such ends that the Christian ministry was appointed, and that such unwarranted claims are a sure way of bringing the whole flood of Romish corruptions upon the faith and practice of our Church.

In taking my leave of Mr. Scott,—and a final leave, because I have now placed sufficient evidence before the public to enable any one, desirous of ascertaining the truth, to judge for himself on the point in question,—I will merely add, that while I cannot account satisfactorily for his deliberate misquotations and reckless mode of dealing with some of the most important points in the discussion, I can make large allowances for a young and earnest controversialist most imperfectly acquainted, as he evidently is, not merely with the subject itself on which he was writing, but with the views of those whom he was opposing; and only hope that when he next takes his pen in hand, he will, for his own sake, be somewhat more correct in his statements, and more careful to acquaint himself both with the points he has to attack and those he has to defend.

II. ANSWER TO THE REV. W. B. FLOWER'S REPLY.

A SECOND defence of the Bishop of Exeter's Letter, against my Reply to it, having appeared in the shape of a Letter to myself from the Rev. W. B. Flower, it would perhaps lead to some misapprehension if I closed the controversy without noticing it. I therefore add here my answer to it.

Mr. Flower commences by assailing me in terms of most elaborate vituperation for the "virulency" with which I have "more than once" assailed "the venerable Prelate" whom he defends. How far that venerable Prelate will thank him for touching upon such a tender point as virulence in controversy is, I think, very doubtful. But for myself I will only say, that so far as the censure applies to the preceding pages, the reader has been already able to judge for himself; and so far as it applies to my previous "Letter to the Bishop of Exeter," I am quite willing to leave that portion of the public that has read the Letter of the Bishop that called it forth, and is acquainted with his recent course, to judge; and no one else has a right to have any opinion on the subject.

Mr. Flower, like the rest of his party, is much annoyed that their great leader and champion, the Bishop of Exeter, should be spoken of in any other terms than those of the most deferential respect. I am sorry to say that I cannot sympathize with him in this matter. I can assure Mr. Flower that no man feels more than I do the propriety of controversy being conducted in a Christian and gentlemanly spirit, as I trust I have abundantly proved, and that in more than one, two, or three cases. But this will never prevent my dealing with such a case as that of the Bishop of Exeter in the way which the interests of truth and justice imperatively demand. Of the gross and *unprovoked* personalities and misrepresentations directed against me in his Lordship's Charge of 1848, I say nothing. Such attacks are comparatively trifling matters. But when a petty tyranny is attempted to be built upon an overbearing dogmatism, and a dogmatism utterly unatoned for by even an amount of learning sufficient to prevent elementary blunders,—when the well-weighed decision of the highest ecclesiastical court in the country, backed by the sanction of the two Primates, is railed at in terms of the most virulent invective, five of the highest Judges in the land being charged with a "suppression of the truth;" with having "wantonly, and in spite of warning, omitted to give attention to a conclusive Canon of the Church," and "decided in contempt of it;" with having been "guilty of a grievous violation of their plain duty, which duty is to administer, not to make laws;" with having "absolutely shut their eyes against the law, for, in this instance, nothing is seen of Justice but her bandage;" with having "tampered with justice," and allowed "other motives besides mere justice and truth" to "sway this sentence;" and his own Metropolitan especially assailed with still more disgraceful vituperations,—and when all this is supported by a declamatory and incendiary style, haughtily assuming, amidst palpable

and even elementary blunders, all the learning to be on his own side ; but just calculated, by its shrewd dexterity and apparent display of erudition, to captivate the public mind,—I say, when such things occur, it is no breach of Christian and gentlemanly conduct to express the feelings with which every Christian and every gentleman *ought* to view such an outbreak, to unmask the real character of the attack, and shew its worthlessness in terms of plain and suitable reprehension ; especially in a notice of it intended for the public at large.

Never, perhaps, were the Bishop of Exeter's *own* words of censure upon certain of his opponents more applicable than on this occasion :—“ When men of rank and education suffer themselves to partake of the blind and intemperate passions of the populace, they become populace themselves ; and are sometimes more prominent than the rest in coarse and vulgar violence, because, having *burst the bands of conventional decorum*, they have *nothing left to restrain them*.” (Past. Lett. 1851. p. 40.)

If Mr. Flower can read the few words I have quoted above—and they give but a feeble idea of the mass of passionate invective of which they form a part—and not blush for their author, I am sorry for him. But neither his insensibility to the character of the outbreak which called forth what he calls my abuse, nor his outpourings of vituperation upon me for that so-called *abuse*, will induce me to withdraw one word from the well-merited language of censure I have used upon the occasion to which he refers.

The notion that such outbreaks should be met just as one would meet any ordinary expression of difference of opinion, I hold to be a totally mistaken view of duty, originating in a misconception of the object which such censure and such exposure ought to have in view ; and what that is I need not specify.

With such controversialists as, for instance, Chancellor Harington it is a pleasure to discuss a question, however opposite may be the views entertained respecting it ; and believing as I do, that large allowance must be made for the different point of view from which different minds have been accustomed to contemplate the same questions, and the powerful effect of feelings and prejudices, hastily imbibed, upon all minds, I feel no disposition to use hard words of men who differ *toto cælo* from me, and maintain their views with the hardest arguments and most earnest words they can find ; nor to accuse them, but upon the clearest evidence, of any misuse of authorities or any disregard to the truth.

But with outbreaks such as that now alluded to, I have no hesitation in dealing as they deserve. And the Bishop of Exeter may congratulate himself, that he has lived in a day when nothing worse has happened to him in consequence of his recent course, than to have his pompously-announced blunders exposed in plain terms, and his vituperations of the highest authorities of the kingdom denounced in the language of well-deserved reprobation.

It might certainly, however, have been supposed, that one so deeply offended with anything like “ virulence,” even when called forth by such outbreaks, and impressed with the vast importance of “ calmly and dispassionately considering” the statements of an opponent “ in a teachable and prayerful spirit,” (p. 2.) would have been careful to have avoided anything approaching to that which he so vehemently condemns.

Were I to recite, however, the coarse and virulent invectives * which Mr. Flower has uttered against me in the course of his 110 pages, I believe the reader would turn away in disgust. In fact, from beginning to end, it is one long piece of vituperative railing, mixed up with dull misconceptions of the points in dispute, misrepresentations which nothing but the hot-headed and intemperate zeal of a partisan can palliate, and wordy attempts at mystifying the reader.

One specimen of his charges against me I will here give. My very title-page calls forth his "most indignant protest;" he "never yet met with any who formed such a low estimate of the demands of their profession as to be capable of adopting so *wretched* a *subterfuge* for the purpose of obtaining a wider circulation;" and he "*blushes to sully his pages*" with it, and begs me to remember the command, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour." What an atrocious title this must have been, the reader will exclaim! What a terrible amount of misrepresentation and abuse it must have concentrated in a few words! Will he bear even the mention of it? Here it is in Mr. Flower's own words. "It is," says Mr. Flower, "a title that speaks of my venerable Diocesan's *second* arraignment of his Metropolitan," and a page and a half follows of indignant expostulation at my having presumed to say that the Bishop of Exeter had "arraigned his Metropolitan." "I own," says Mr. Flower, "to burning indignation as I write the words."

The question naturally suggests itself, What can all this mean? I can only recommend him to consult his Johnson's Dictionary, and learn the meaning of the word *arraign*. Many will think that I might justly have used a much stronger term. When a Bishop publishes a bulky pamphlet against his Archbishop, endeavouring to prove that his deliberately expressed views on a very important point are wholly opposed to the doctrine of our Church, and that his statements are calculated to lead to "*extensive and pernicious error*," (p. 12.) does he not *arraign* that Archbishop at the bar of public opinion, on a charge of the most serious kind? Mr. Flower himself talks (p. 4) of the Bishop "*vindicating the Church of England from the SCANDAL that had been given*;" given, that is, by the Archbishop. It would be trifling with the patience of the reader to detain him any longer upon such a point. But it is an apt specimen of the mode in which Mr Flower's whole pamphlet is got up.

And before I proceed to reply to his arguments, there is one point more requiring at least a passing notice. The reader has already seen somewhat of the manner in which Mr. Flower treats any remarks inculpating the Bishop of Exeter. I need hardly say that his pamphlet teems with similar instances. And in one place he has expressly main-

* A few specimens, in a note, may not be out of place.

"I feel that I address you at a great disadvantage. I have not graduated in the same school as yourself; I have not learnt that abuse is argument, and vituperation a characteristic of a follower of the Crucified." (p. 2.) "The petty subterfuges by which you endeavour to make good your cause. The language that disgraces your almost every page is most painful." (p. 99.) "Direct falsification." (p. 100.) "Do have some little regard for truth, if you have none for gentlemanly bearing." (p. 102.) The reader will, no doubt, appreciate the "disadvantage" under which Mr. Flower labours in the absence of school-training for the art of which he speaks, and will give him all due credit for the proficiency he has attained by his own unassisted exertions.

tained, as the Anglican theory of episcopacy, a notion derived from some passages ascribed to Ignatius, that to the Bishop the clergy are to "*render obedience as unto the Lord*," &c., "unless deadly heresy were enjoined upon them." And to this there is "only one restriction," "viz., that a Bishop should do all according to and for the Church of Christ, and nothing against it." (p. 33.) Such are Mr. Flower's sentiments; and accordingly he has no terms sufficiently strong to express his indignation at anything that touches the Bishop of Exeter.

Now then, let us see this same gentleman's language towards one to whom, upon his own theory, he owes still greater respect than to the Bishop, as the Bishop's ecclesiastical superior. After declaring his "surprise that so little has been said [by the Bishop of Exeter] when such *ample materials* were at hand for the composition of a *bill of indictment* against His Grace," he adds the following statement:

"The memory of the past . . . prevents my expressing all the grief I feel in the depth of my heart, when I think that *our own days have seen an Archbishop do that* which Oxlee, writing more than twenty years ago, said had never occurred before. His words are most remarkable, and therefore I quote them; 'I do not believe that we ever had an Archbishop of Canterbury so **DESTITUTE OF MORAL WORTH**, as not readily to incur a *præmunire* rather than to consecrate a notoriously wicked man, *or to suffer his religion to be insulted by the wantonness of the Privy Council*.' [Mr. Flower's own italics.] **THIS ALAS! CAN NO LONGER BE SAID.**" (p. 5.)

I leave this statement to the reader to do justice upon.

So much for the value of a High Churchman's respect for Bishops when they happen to differ from him. Mr. Flower will pen you a long dissertation full of extracts from the Fathers to prove that Bishops are to be followed *as you would follow the Lord*, and rail abundantly at "Low Churchmen" for questioning such a position. But then mind, adds Mr. Flower, this only applies to those who "do all according to and for the Church of Christ, and nothing against it;" and *of that he is to be the judge*. Therefore any censure directed against the Bishop of Exeter is worthy of the most intense indignation, but the Archbishop of Canterbury, and all like him, may be abused and insulted *ad libitum*. I humbly take leave to prefer that so called "Low-Church" view which adopts neither of these extremes.

Such is the *animus* with which this pamphlet has been written.

I now proceed to its arguments.

First comes the 19th Article. Mr. Flower asks me whether the passages I have adduced against the Bishop's restrictions upon preaching are "so clear and conclusive upon the point as you would lead us to believe," and courteously informs me, that I "cannot be ignorant," that they do not support the inferences I have drawn from them; appending some extracts from the comments of Whitby and Hammond. (pp. 7—10.) I reply that I am perfectly willing to leave them in the hands of any impartial reader. The comments of Whitby and Hammond are no doubt always entitled to be treated with respect. But as to their authority settling such a question, I will only say that when Mr. Flower has undertaken to abide by their decision in all cases, I will do the same. Hammond's comment here is a remarkable specimen of the way in which a preconceived prejudice can twist a passage to mean what is agreeable to the commentator. And Whitby's assertion, that miracles were wrought by the early preachers referred to, because it is said that "the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number believed and

turned unto the Lord," (Acts xi. 21.) and by Apollos because he is styled (as Whitby translates) "a minister by whom they believed according to the gift that God had given him," (1 Cor. iii. 5.) and a "co-worker with God," is one which may safely be left to the judgment of any impartial person. At any rate, the parties whose title to the ministerial office Mr. Flower is here attacking can point to similar "miracles" in favour of their claim. And I will answer him in the words of our learned Archdeacon Mason: (already quoted in my first Tract on this subject, p. 39.) "If you will not believe us disputing for the lawfulness of their calling, yet you must give us leave to believe God himself from heaven approving their ministry by pouring down a blessing upon their labours."

Mr. Flower next gives us a specimen of his powers in Greek criticism, and, of course, prepared without hesitation *jurare in verba magistri*, pronounces *ex cathedra*, after the Bishop, that κηρυσσειν "must necessarily imply that authority has been given to execute the particular office involved in it." (p. 10.) I have already shown (p. 94, above) that an ordinary acquaintance with the way in which the word is used in the New Testament would have preserved him from the mistake.

But Mr. Flower has testimony in his favour as to the qualifications necessary for preaching, which he "rejoices to say" is "none other than the great Cranmer himself." And accordingly, utterly unconscious, I suppose, of the contents of the treatise he is quoting, and that Cranmer did not write it, he gives us a long extract from what is called "Cranmer's Catechism." How far the extract would prove what it is adduced as maintaining, I shall not inquire (though I might notice that point); but when I inform him that the work was only a translation of a German work, published with Cranmer's sanction, I suppose he will no longer quote it as one by "the great Cranmer himself;" and when I add that it maintains that there are three Sacraments (to mention no other points), he will not, I conceive, adduce it any longer as shewing what the doctrine of the reformed Church of England is.

After all, does Mr. Flower suppose that a whole folio of words and authorities could give a feather's weight to the Bishop's argument from the simple word "preached?" If he does, I leave him, unmolested, to the enjoyment of his notion.

He proceeds (p. 14) to the 23rd Article.

Of the scurrilous language with which Mr. Flower commences, I of course take no notice; and in reply to his two irrelevant pages on my remark (p. 11 above) on the Bishop's quotation from Hammond, shall simply ask him to look to his Chronology and ascertain whether Volkelius lived before the formation of the Foreign Protestant Churches, and he will then perhaps understand the justice of my observations.

Then follow six pages on the Article itself, the reasoning of which is merely an amplification of what the Bishop has said; and the authorities are a passage from the nonjuror Brett, and a long citation of nearly two pages from the work he had previously erroneously attributed to Cranmer, and now speaks of again as penned by him; and, in utter ignorance of its contents, talks of it as if we might judge by it how Cranmer himself would have explained the Article.

I have already, in my reply to Mr. Scott (p. 94, above), explained in few words the real state of the case with respect to the Bishop's interpretation of the Article, and therewith I leave the matter to the reader's judgment. The question here is not what is the true doctrine on the subject,

(which Mr. Flower has confounded with it,) but what the Article *decides*; and it is obvious that the Bishop has made the Article say what it has not said, but carefully abstained from saying. And in reply to his comments on the doctrine, I refer him to Saravia and Dean Field,* and, to use his own words respecting Bishop Burnet, “with all deference decline the consideration of a passage which affords such ample materials for dissection.” I am perfectly contented to leave the matter as already argued to the common sense of the reader; with which Mr. Flower, if convinced of the goodness of his cause, has no reason to feel dissatisfied.

Mr. Flower proceeds (p. 24) to the 36th Article, which sanctions the Ordinal. In commenting on the Bishop’s dealing with this part of the subject, I have pointed out that he has quoted a passage requiring episcopal ordination in all who minister in our Church,—which was not introduced into the Ordinal till 1661, and was contrary to the practice of our Church during the time of Elizabeth and James,—as if it had been inserted in the Ordinal from the first, and afforded proof that the Bishop’s doctrine on this point is that of our Church. Now it is no proof of the Bishop’s doctrine at all: it merely directs that episcopal ordination shall be requisite for the ministry *in our Church*. And the facts, that it was not in the Ordinal till 1661, and that the practice of our Church till then was contrary to its directions, entirely subvert the Bishop’s argument, that it amounts to a declaration by our Church that no other ordination is valid.

How does Mr. Flower meet this?

He first “protests” against the supposition, that “upon the testimonies of the Elizabethan period must rest the proof of the original and genuine doctrine of the Reformed Protestant Church.” Now, were we to allow that this protest is well-grounded, how does this justify the Bishop? And, whatever Mr. Flower’s opinion may be, the common sense of impartial persons will tell them, that the united testimonies of all our great divines at the period when the Prayer Book was drawn up, form the best evidence of the way in which it was originally understood, and of the original and genuine doctrine of our Church. Mr. Flower adds: “Here, by one of those strange phenomena that rarely occur, you are in perfect agreement with the Romanizers whom you rebuke,” referring to Mr. Maskell. (p. 24.) I can assure Mr. Flower that I hope ever to be “in perfect agreement” even with “Romanizers” on such points; and believe that the best thing I could wish for many of those who still belong to our communion is, half the candour and honesty of Mr. Maskell.

Mr. Flower adds (p. 25, 26) a long quotation from Mr. Watson’s reply to my Letter to the Bishop of Exeter in confirmation of his “protest,” of which I can only say, that if any one is convinced by it, argument would be useless with him. I may observe, in passing, that it is curious to see how Mr. Watson’s friend Mr. Flower avenges his friend’s quarrel for my neglect of his pamphlet, by intimating to the reader, on every possible occasion, what pain it caused me. Commencing his Letter with a reference to it of this nature, he here again quotes its words as “no doubt painfully familiar” to me; and again, in p. 78, would fain

* See the passages in my first tract on this subject, pp. 21 and 37, and pp. 31—34 above.

make the reader imagine how terribly I am still smarting from its effects.

Mr. Flower is a young controversialist, and will probably find out before long the true value of such devices. But when we come to p. 78, he will perhaps be better able to appreciate the nature of the feelings it produced. If he wishes to know my real sentiments with respect to it, I will tell him: I went once carefully through it, and having found it to be a heavy, rambling, illogical production, full of mistakes, misconceptions, and misrepresentations, which would have taken a folio to point them all out and refute, and most of which would have no effect upon an intelligent reader with respect to the point at issue, I left them to their fate; and Mr. Flower may perhaps see presently what will make him more cautious in defending it. When a matter has been so fully placed before the public as the question had been about which Mr. Watson wrote, it must be a very different production from Mr. Watson's to make it worth while to answer a long pamphlet on the subject. When there has been enough of discussion and controversy to enable any mind in search of the truth to see what and where it is, I am satisfied, and have no care to refute all the misrepresentations and errors of all those who like to wrangle on about the matter.

But Mr. Flower proceeds to urge, that "we have to deal with the Prayer Book as it *is*, and not as it *was*." (p. 26.) No doubt. This no one denies. And if the passage inserted in the Ordinal in 1661 proved the Bishop's doctrine, he would have been justified in asserting it to be the doctrine of the Church of England. But it does no such thing. It merely requires that those who minister in our Church should have episcopal orders; a requisition which the Bishop and Mr. Flower both know very well is considered just and proper by many who wholly deny their doctrine.

And reverting to this point in p. 35, he gives us the following specimen of his reasoning powers. "You confess that the additions made at the last revision of the Prayer Book did pledge our divines to a higher view than that which, as you think, formerly obtained; and *thus you grant the whole question*, for it is with those additions that we have to deal. You wish to preserve some mode of escape from your admission, by a statement, *which I cannot understand*, 'about ministry in the Church of England,' and no decision 'upon the question in the abstract.'" Now until Mr. Flower *could understand* this simple statement, he ought to have been altogether silent upon the matter; and instead of my concession "granting the whole question," it does not touch the question; because it merely concedes, that whereas before 1661 there was no requisition that all who ministered in our Church should have had episcopal ordination, after that time this requisition was in force. But the *abstract* question, whether nothing but episcopal ordination is valid under any circumstances, and in any part of the Church, is *not touched* by it.

The attempt of the Bishop and his followers to bind our Church to this abstract doctrine on account of her having, since 1661, required her own ministers to have episcopal ordination, is one the futility of which is so apparent, that I will not waste any more words upon it.

But Mr. Flower has one more argument on this point, which, by the space given to it (pp. 27—35), seems to be his *magnus Apollo*. He thus quotes the words of the preface to the Ordinal: "It is evident unto

all men diligently reading Holy Scriptures and ancient authors, &c." And from these words he argues, that our Church requires us to believe the doctrine of Episcopacy as laid down in ancient authors; and then, having quoted divers high-flown statements of the power and privileges of Bishops from some early Fathers, and jumped from them to the conclusion that "the doctrine of the *Catholic Church* unequivocally is, that none apart from Bishops can confer valid ordination," he declares that the words he has quoted from the preface prove that this is the doctrine of *our Church*.

Now, without stopping to notice the groundlessness of such a deduction from the words of the preface, which merely state a *fact* without referring to the Fathers in any way as an authority for *any doctrine*, I refer Mr. Flower to the answer I have already given to Mr. Scott (p. 98, above) on the same point. And when he quoted Crakanthorpe (pp. 27, 28), he ought to have recollected that I have already proved,* that Crakanthorpe is directly opposed to his doctrine.

The Bishop had endeavoured to support his view of the meaning of the Ordinal, by alleging that if "persons from Berlin, and Geneva, calling themselves ministers of Christ's Church, are really such ministers, it would be a direct act of schism for our Church to reject their ministry, for all who are Christ's ministers at all are his ministers throughout his whole Church." Mr. Flower is very angry with me for calling this argument a cobweb, and thinks to silence me by quoting Archbishop Potter to prove that "the office and character of men in Holy Orders extends over the whole Church," jumping to the same conclusion with the Bishop, that "the denial of the right of such to minister in any part of the Church" is "schism."

I admit the premises most fully; and therefore I am not disposed to deny the office of a minister of Christ's Church to the ministers of the foreign Protestant Churches, whom I believe to be true ministers of Christ, wherever they are found: but I totally deny the conclusion. Ordination does not give a man a right to go and minister wherever he pleases all over the world; and a local Church has a right to employ in her own field of labour those whom she may consider best suited for the purpose, without denying the *validity* of the Orders of others. In fact the argument is subverted by our own practice. A Colonial Bishop, until the last session of Parliament, could not legally perform any episcopal act in this country. And a clergyman ordained by a Colonial Bishop, not at the time in possession of a see, and actually residing in it, is *incapable* of "officiating at any place, or in any manner, as a minister of the Established Church of England and Ireland." (59 Geo. iii. c. 60.)

Therefore, according to the argument of the Bishop of Exeter and Mr. Flower, the Church of England denied that the one was a Bishop at all, and still denies that the other has any valid ordination. Would the Bishop of Exeter give the latter a second ordination?

On the question of re-ordination (Flower, pp. 38, 39), I add nothing to what I have already written (pp. 20—22, above); to which Mr. Flower merely opposes certain dogmatizing sentences, which are worth just as much as Mr. Flower's *ipse dixit* is worth; concluding with

* See pp. 57, 58, above, and my first Tract on this subject, entitled "Doctrine," &c., p. 39.

the very characteristic remark, (the *Achilles* of Tractarian arguments), even "supposing that Burnet and Bingham supported your view," "they cannot overthrow *the teaching of the Catholic Church*;" what "the teaching of the Catholic Church" is, being of course to be decided by Mr. Flower and his friends; such persons as Burnet and Bingham, and a host of similar authorities, knowing nothing about that teaching.

For Bramhall's views (which Chancellor Harington is here said to have "vindicated") I refer to what I have already written.*

Mr. Flower proceeds to the question, whether the three orders are of direct Divine appointment, and "the polity" the apostles adopted "unalterable," (p. 40 et seq.) and "shudders to contemplate" the consequences of my maintaining the negative. I must reply, that I, on my part, "shudder to contemplate" the temerity of one who can rush into such a discussion so ignorant on the subject as not to know that the vast majority of the advocates for Episcopacy, and the most learned of them, freely admit that it cannot be shewn to be of direct Divine appointment. And, unfortunately, there is something more than ignorance; for he has actually quoted in defence of his "shuddering" the passage from Sanderson given by the Bishop of Exeter, though he knew, (for the proof was lying before him in my pamphlet which he was refuting), that the context proves that Sanderson merely proposed his view as something that appeared to him very probable, "*leaving other men to the liberty of their own judgments*," and expressly said, that even those of our divines who "speak of this government as established by Divine right, are not all of them necessarily so to be understood as if they meant it in that first and stricter sense." (See pp. 39—41, above.) From this specimen the reader may draw his own inferences. And while on this point, I will just notice another exhibition of the same spirit occurring in the context, although almost too ludicrous an instance of his anxiety to misrepresent to render it worthy of citation. He accuses me of referring to "*my Doctrine of the Church of England*." Some of his readers would probably wonder what could be meant. Their surprise will probably not be abated when I inform them, that having published a pamphlet entitled "*The Doctrine of the Church of England on Non-Episcopal Ordinations*," I had occasion to refer to it several times in the course of my answer to the Bishop, and the *real* note to which Mr. Flower refers in the words I have quoted from him stands thus:—See my "*Doctrine of the Church of Eng. on Non-Episc. Ordinations*." (See p. 23, above.) Alas for the controversialist who is driven to such weapons to make good his cause!

As to "the polity established by the Apostles" not being "unalterable," I will not waste the time of the reader by referring him to more than the authority of Hooker, who expressly says (to quote no more) that the authority of Bishops is "a sword which the Church hath power to take from them," intimating that there is no "heavenly law" by which the Lord "hath appointed Presbyters for ever to be under the regiment of Bishops." (Eccl. Pol. vii. 5.)

Mr. Flower next proceeds to deal with the Catena of authorities I have given in my first Tract on this subject,† and attempts to shew, that I have placed an incorrect interpretation upon the passages I have

* See "Doctrine," &c., pp. 32, 33; and Reply to Churton & Harington, p. 32.

† Doctrine of the Church of England on Non-Episcopal Ordinations.

quoted from Archbishop Whitgift and Bishop Cooper; and having done this, he is very prudently "not at all solicitous to examine any of my other authorities." (p. 49.) What success he has had in his attempt upon these two, I will now examine.

And, first, for his verbal criticism. Having learnedly informed his readers, that the phrase "Church government" comprehends many other points besides the question of Episcopacy, and quoted Hooker to shew, that "the greatest part conceive thereby only the exercise of superiority peculiar unto rulers and guides of others," he blushes not to assert that into this error I have fallen; and that "*attaching but one meaning to the word,*" I "have forthwith jumped to the conclusion that, wherever it occurred, Episcopacy is necessarily alluded to." I need hardly say that I have done nothing of the kind.

And in order to shew that Whitgift thought Episcopacy an essential and necessary matter, and that other points only connected with Church government were "accidental" and non-essential, he quotes a passage which makes directly against him, but which, from his want of acquaintance with the phraseology of the times, he has not been able to understand. Whitgift, distinguishing between the "*essential* points of the government of the Church" and the "*accidental,*" explains the former to be "the Gospel truly preached, the sacraments rightly ministered, discipline duly executed, and such like," saying not a word of the mode in which the ministry is to be constituted; and the latter "*the manner of electing ministers, the kind of discipline,* accidental ceremonies, and other such like rites and circumstances," which he says "may be varied according to time, place, and persons." Here, to say nothing of the phrase "the manner of electing ministers," the phrase "*kind of discipline*" includes the consideration of the officers by whom the discipline was to be executed, as Mr. Flower ought to have known. The word "discipline" was constantly used in the controversies of that period in this sense. See, for instance, Dr. Cosin, as quoted in my "Doctrine," &c. (p. 24); and "A full and plain declaration of *ecclesiastical discipline* out of the Word of God," 1574. 4to.; and "A defence of the *ecclesiastical discipline* ordained of God to be used in his Church." 1588. 4to. So Archbishop Bramhall (Works, 493.) speaks of "the Scottish Discipline," meaning their whole platform of Church government. And Dr. Barrow calls "the exercise of episcopal ordination and jurisdiction" "this ancient *form of discipline.*" (Serm. of Obed. to our Spirit. Guides.)

But what Mr. Flower is aiming at, is to make the reader suppose that Whitgift and Cooper, when speaking of Church government in the passages I have quoted from them, were not referring to episcopacy *at all*, but used the phrase "kind of government," &c., *only* with reference to some of the minor points in the matter of Church government. And thus, having elaborately proved the *comprehensive* character of the phrase "Church government," and censured my supposed exclusive appropriation of it to one point, he himself proceeds to do the same thing, and declares that in these passages it is *exclusively* used with reference to another matter. I deny altogether that such is the case. It is the whole platform of ecclesiastical government of which Archbishop Whitgift is there speaking, including the nature of the ruling power. Mr. Flower's criticism is just as if a person should say, when a monarchy and a republic are being compared together, and the phrase "kind of government" is used, it only refers to the administration of

the laws, and things of that kind, and does not include the nature of the ruling power. Moreover, Whitgift himself continually uses the phrase in the same work with special reference to the nature of the ruling power in the Church, contrasting the "kind of government" by Bishops with other kinds, as in pp. 377, 420, and 422; so that it would be absurd to suppose, that in another place, when speaking in general terms of "the kind of government of the Church," he does not include the nature of the ruling power. Against the first extract Mr. Flower urges the context, and quotes a passage speaking about excommunication and censures of the Church, as if it proved that such points were the only matters in Whitgift's contemplation. Any intelligent reader would see at once, from his own quotation, that it does nothing of the kind. What Whitgift says is, that, judging from Cartwright's mention of excommunication, &c., he supposes he is speaking of the "*external* government of the Church" by men, not of the "*spiritual*" by God himself, and so proceeds to deal with the question of the *external* government.

Nay, the passage itself is as clear as the sun against Mr. Flower. For the question between us is, Whether it is an essential note of a Church to have the episcopal succession and the threefold order of ministry; and Whitgift expressly says, "the essential notes of the Church be these *only*, the true preaching of the word of God, and the right administration of the Sacraments." When Mr. Flower denies that this is conclusive, because the question is, "Who are they that are lawfully called to preach the Word and administer the Sacraments?" he is only trifling with the patience of his readers. For, can he suppose, that if Whitgift thought a ministry by episcopal succession an essential note of a true Church, he could have spoken thus? And we may observe that Whitgift, in this very passage, (as constantly throughout his book) refers to "the judgment of the Reformed Churches" in proof of his position.

His remarks on the other extracts are similarly erroneous. And then comes a direct proof that he has not even the least idea of what he had got to prove, or, at any rate, of what would amount to a proof of it. For the point for which Whitgift was adduced was (to use Whitgift's own words), that the Scripture has not "set down any one certain form and kind of government of the Church TO BE PERPETUAL FOR ALL TIMES, PERSONS, AND PLACES, WITHOUT ALTERATION." This was the proposition maintained against the Bishop, and supported by the authority of Whitgift. And to shew that Whitgift did not maintain it, Mr. Flower now proceeds to quote passages from him, asserting that the episcopal form of Church government is to be found in the inspired apostolic writings, and has continued in the Church ever since; a proposition totally different, and one which he either knows, or ought to know, those against whom he is writing maintain as much as himself, and, like Whitgift, "see no cause why" this form of government "should not be perpetual." His reasons for thus endeavouring to throw dust into the eyes of the reader, I leave others to determine.

But I will here add to the extracts I have before given* from Whitgift one more passage, which I suppose Mr. Flower himself will admit to be conclusive against him. In the Preface to the work already quoted, Whitgift says:—

* Doctrine, &c., pp. 19, 20. Reply to Churton and Harington, p. 30.

“This Reply of T. C. consisteth of two *false principles and rotten pillars* : whereof the one is, *that we must of necessity have the same kind of government that was in the Apostles’ time and is expressed in the Scriptures, and no other* ; the other is, that we may not in any wise or in any consideration retain in the Church anything that hath been abused under the Pope ; if these two posts be weak, yea rotten, (*as I have proved them to be in this my Defence,*) then must the building of necessity fall. Touching the first, it is to be understood that there is a double government of the Church, the one spiritual, the other external. . . . The external government hath both a substance and a matter about which it is occupied, and also *a form to attain the same, consisting in certain offices and functions and in the names and titles of them* : the substance and matter of government must indeed be taken out of the Word of God, and consisteth in these points, that the word be truly taught, the Sacraments rightly administered, virtue furthered, vice repressed, and the Church kept in quietness and order. The offices in the Church whereby this government is wrought, be not namely and particularly expressed in the Scriptures, but in some points left to the discretion and liberty of the Church, to be disposed according to the state of times, places, and persons.”

Precisely similar is Mr. Flower’s treatment of the extracts from Bishop Cooper ; and perhaps even less defensible, because in the *immediate context* of the passages I have quoted (and Mr. Flower professes to have consulted the context) the Bishop expressly refers to “the office, authority, and jurisdiction of bishops,” (p. 62.) in a way that shews that this was what he was particularly alluding to when speaking of Church government, and continually throughout the pages quoted (61—67) shews that Episcopacy was particularly in his eye when he wrote what I have quoted from him. Mr. Flower’s remarks, therefore, upon these passages, are such as can only bring disgrace upon himself, and shew how totally unworthy of confidence his representations are ; partly, no doubt, from his want of acquaintance with these matters, and partly, I must add, from a reckless resolution to make out a preconceived case.

A long irrelevant passage from Hooker follows, (pp. 51, 52.) which Mr. Flower either does not understand, or wishes the reader to misunderstand. Hooker’s views on this question I have already abundantly proved.*

Mr. Flower proceeds to discuss the question of the parity of order in Bishops and Presbyters, upon which he spends *twenty-seven pages*. And as might be expected from the way in which he has already dealt with other points (whether from ignorance, carelessness, or unscrupulousness,) has contrived effectually to overlay and hide the truth amidst a heap of rubbish.

Mr. Flower commences with a complaint that he cannot understand my argument. (p. 52.) I am sorry for it, though not surprised at it, as he is very apt not to understand what others have said, especially when he dislikes the doctrine advocated. And he has made it very evident that he has been here writing of what he does not understand. This theory of parity, he says, “the Bishop of Exeter very properly tells you is ‘rank Popery’ ;” and he can picture my “astonishment” as my “eyes fell upon the accusation.” I can assure him that I have long ceased to feel “astonishment” at anything emanating from that quarter.

But he has a passage of Bishop Burnet to prove it ; and Burnet is my “great authority ;” and if I “want the honey,” I “must take the gall

* See “Doctrine,” &c., pp. 20, 21, and pp. 37, 38, above.

also ;" that is, if I quote Bishop Burnet's opinion on one point, I am bound to maintain everything he has asserted ; Mr. Flower having, I suppose, completely forgotten that, a few pages before, (p. 20.) he has himself spoken most contemptuously of the same Burnet whom he now relies upon. But to answer once for all this silly charge of Popery, I shall merely quote a few words from the immortal Usher, whose name ought to silence for ever such theologians as I am now replying to :—

"I have ever," says the Archbishop, "declared my opinion to be, that *episcopus et presbyter gradu tantum differunt non ordine*, and consequently that in places where bishops cannot be had, *the ordination by presbyters standeth valid.*" (See the whole passage in my first Tract on this subject, pp. 34, 35.)

After such a statement by such a man, (to mention no others, such as Archdeacon Mason, Dean Field, &c.) what a mockery does it seem to hear Mr. Flower magisterially laying it down as an incontrovertible fact, that the doctrine of the whole Catholic Church is opposed to such a notion ; as if Usher did not know a hundredfold more of the remains of antiquity than Mr. Flower has ever seen or heard of, or probably is likely to do.

But Mr. Flower proceeds to criticise the extracts I have given from a number of our divines, shewing that they held the doctrine of the parity of order in Bishops and Presbyters. And to answer his whole series of criticisms upon these passages, it is scarcely necessary to do more than remind the reader, that I distinctly intimated that this doctrine did not necessarily *involve* the further question of the validity of Presbyterian ordination, or oppose the notion that Bishops had an "authority and jurisdiction in spiritual regiment" not belonging to Presbyters, (see pp. 25, 30, 31, above), but only "goes far to remove the difficulty as to recognising the validity of Presbyterian ordination in the absence of Bishops." (p. 24, above.) And therefore, when I quoted authorities to *this effect*, I quoted them merely as testifying to *this point*, and left the reader to draw his inference as to what were the views of those of *our* divines who took this ground on the question of the Orders of the Foreign Non-Episcopal Churches; which I doubt not will be, with impartial persons, that they probably took the view which some of them (Usher among the number) have specifically expressed. At any rate, they maintain what leads easily to such a conclusion. Some indeed may think, that an institution of the early Church, or at any rate one that is apostolical, must be adhered to; and therefore that there can be no valid ordination without an episcopate. But others will think, that if Presbyters and Bishops are of the same ministerial order, there is little difficulty in recognising the right of Presbyters, in churches under the circumstances of the Foreign Protestant Churches, to perform, with the concurrence of their Church, the duties that usually devolve upon Bishops. In fact, if the ancient regimen had been kept up, by their appointing one of their number to be Bishop, they would have been in almost complete conformity with the primitive model.

But it is of course convenient to Mr. Flower, and quite characteristic, to represent me as quoting these passages as asserting more than this, and then to accuse me of misrepresentation.

The reader will bear in mind, therefore, the object for which such passages are adduced. If Bishops and Priests are of the same ministerial

order, then the right of giving ordination depends only on *office*, not on the possession of ministerial orders of a superior kind.

Mr. Flower says, that the question is, whether the passages I have quoted maintain "that the power of conferring orders was a ministerial function essentially inherent in Bishops and Priests." (p. 55.) No doubt it is. But does not Mr. Flower see that this is involved in the doctrine that Bishops and Priests are of the same ministerial order? If he does not, he does not understand the meaning of the words. To say that a Presbyterian is of the same ministerial order as a Bishop, is to say, in other words, that, so far as his ordination is concerned, he is qualified to perform the same ministerial functions. What is meant by the assertion that a Bishop and a Presbyterian are of the same order, is, that a Presbyterian needs no *fresh ordination* to enable him to execute the office of a Bishop, but may do so on being appointed to the office. But of course it does not necessarily follow, that he has the right to perform them all, just according to his own pleasure, any more than he has a right to exercise them in whatever *place* he likes. In both respects, the good order of the Church requires a limitation to be placed on the exercise of his functions. The good of the Church may require, that in each city one Presbyterian should be appointed to preside over the rest, as *primus inter pares*, and no one be ordained but by his ministry in conjunction with some of his brethren. And so we find it to have been in the Church of Alexandria for a long period, where the Bishop was only one of the Presbyters selected by themselves to be their president, and was received as their Bishop without any ordination or consecration by other Bishops. (Hieron. Epist. ad Evagr.)

In this view Presbyters are ordained to minister in sacred things generally and without exception. But the Church finding it convenient that the work of ordination should be limited to a few, made it a part of the duties of the Episcopal *office*, which was given only to a few Presbyters. And I am convinced we have ground to think that the episcopal form of Church government was introduced by the Apostles. It is clear, however, that Jerome held, that the superiority of the Bishop to the Presbyterian was only a regulation of the Post-Apostolic Church, made for the sake of preserving the Church from schisms. (Epist. ad Evagr. and Comment. in Tit. c. 1.)

Mr. Flower begins with the quotations from Cranmer;* and to prove that he held (subsequently to writing the passage I have quoted from him) that Bishops and Priests were two distinct orders *in the highest sense of the word*, he gives himself the trouble of quoting and commenting on a long passage from the "Reformatio Legum," which is *perfectly useless* to prove his point. The passage is simply an account of the duties belonging to bishops, priests, and deacons in the Church of England, and the only point in it that has a shadow of relevance to the present controversy is, that it speaks of duties belonging to Bishops *ex Dei præscripto*; a phrase which evidently means nothing more than duties spoken of as belonging to their office in Holy Scripture. I have already shewn him what his own great authority Sanderson has said as to the use of this phrase by our divines. (See p. 110, above). Neither does it touch the question, whether a Presbyterian may not be placed by

* See "Doctrine," &c., pp. 13—16.

his Church in the episcopal office. In fact, the passage proves less than the Ordinal itself, for the Ordinal speaks of bishops, priests, and deacons as three orders, which this passage does not.

I can assure Mr. Flower, therefore, that I have no wish to "ignore the existence of the 'Reformatio Legum'" (see p. 62) when discussing this subject; nor to "forget to inform" my readers that, "amongst those engaged in its preparation were Goodrich, Cox, Ridley, Taylor, and May;" nor still further, to forget, what Mr. Flower *has forgotten* to mention, that though these parties were in the Commission, the real parties whom Cranmer associated with himself in drawing it up were *Peter Martyr*, Dr. Rowland Taylor, and Walter Haddon; *Peter Martyr* having the principal hand in it. (See Strype's Cranmer, i. 191, 192. Oxf. ed.) Few have more frequently referred publicly to this book than I have; and I suspect Mr. Flower, if better acquainted with it than he is, would not be so anxious to extol its authority. I would advise him to read what Mr. Maskell (when holding Mr. Flower's views on ecclesiastical matters) said of the work.

As to the extract from Chancellor Harington (pp. 61, 62), attempting to show that Cranmer soon changed the views he had expressed in his answers to the King, I will only say that I hope it was so; for I should be sorry to maintain all he there stated. But the evidence so adduced is, to my mind, totally insufficient for the purpose; and if it were, would not make him say enough for Mr. Flower's purpose.

Mr. Flower could not quarrel with my quotation from Dr. Alley, because he could not get anywhere a copy of the book. I shall be happy to lend him one whenever he likes to apply for it, as I am always glad to have my authorities investigated.

Next comes Pilkington (p. 63), whose words (among others I quoted) are,—“This is to be understood, that *the privileges and superiorities* which Bishops have above other ministers are rather granted by man for maintaining of better order and quietness in commonwealths than commanded by God in his word.”* This surely is plain enough. It grants the whole question. No, nothing of the kind, says Mr. Flower; and then comes (pp. 63, 66, 67, 71) one of the most astounding and disgraceful misrepresentations of a remarkably plain passage that I have ever met with, accompanied with abuse of me for not extending my extract to parts of the context which do not in the slightest degree affect the question at issue, or the meaning of the passage I have given from him above, but which Mr. Flower tries to avail himself of (pp. 66, 67) in a way which I most willingly leave the reader to do justice upon. Mr. Flower's censures (p. 71) I can afford to leave to the judgment of the public. My exposure of Tractarian Catenæ, which have become a by-word and a proverb, has no doubt rendered the *tu quoque* argument a tempting one; but Mr. Flower should have recollected, that when unfairly used, it wounds only him who strikes with it. The point is in the wrong direction.

He proceeds (p. 64) to the extracts from Jewell and Whitgift;† and the result of a long dull criticism of several pages upon their statements is, that they only held “the very same ‘parity’ as S. Jerome and the other writers whom they quoted;” and that this parity “did

* See “Doctrine,” &c. pp. 17, 18.

† See “Doctrine,” &c. pp. 18, 19.

not involve the denial of a superiority." (p. 69.) Here again Mr. Flower shews complete ignorance of the point at issue. No such denial has been made, but in fact the contrary asserted.

The utter confusion into which Mr. Flower has thrown the subject, and how little he understands what he is writing about, may be judged of from one or two extracts from him. The question, he says, is, whether Bishops and Priests "are so one, that neither has powers or prerogatives which are not shared in common by the others:" (p. 66.) although the author against whom he is writing *expressly maintains* that the office of Bishop is superior in its powers and prerogatives to that of a mere Presbyter. Again: "A Presbyter and a Deacon have duties in common; and from these you might as well argue that they are one order, as upon this principle make Bishops and Priests to be of the same order." (p. 66.) I need hardly say that no such argument has been offered by me.

And attempting to shew that Whitgift has been misrepresented, he quotes from him the two following sentences: "So that M. Doctor saith truly, that *it is one thing to be a Bishop, and another to be a Priest*, because every Bishop is a Priest, but every Priest is not a Bishop." "And therefore he saith, *Presbyter continetur in Episcopo*, because every Bishop is Presbyter, but every Presbyter is not Bishop." And then asking me why I "did not add these important *qualifications*," (!) he charges me with a "convenient *suppressio veri*." (p. 72.) And then he quotes divers passages in which Whitgift speaks of the duties belonging to the Episcopal office, among which of course he reckons "the ordering of ministers," (the passage from Epiphanius not being given by him as representing precisely his own views,) and concludes with a flourish of abuse against me for misrepresenting him. (pp. 72, 73.) All this is so puerile that I will not waste the time of the reader upon it. Mr. Flower's wits must have been woolgathering.

Mr. Flower says (p. 68) that these divines appealed to Jerome "with the full reception of his entire views," and "did not dream of any other 'parity' than that which he himself had laid down." He could not have used a more unfortunate argument for his cause. For not only does Jerome say, that a Bishop and Presbyter are the same (*idem*), and that originally the churches were governed *communi consilio Presbyterorum*, and makes the origin of Bishops to be from an ecclesiastical decree, "*ut unus de Presbyteris electus superponeretur ceteris, ad quem omnis ecclesiæ cura pertineret, et schismatum semina tollerentur*," but expressly adds, that Bishops must recollect "*se magis consuetudine quam dispositionis Dominicæ veritate [? virtute] Presbyteris esse majores*:" (Comment. in Tit. c. 1.) which effectually answers the passage quoted by Mr. Flower from Morinus as to Jerome's views.

But "the 'parity' Jerome maintained did not involve the denial of a superiority," exclaims Mr. Flower. Of course it did not; nor does the "parity" maintained by those against whom Mr. Flower is arguing. But he is groping in the dark, without a notion apparently even of the real question at issue.*

* The question discussed above, is, what is the doctrine of the Church of England and her divines. But if Mr. Flower wishes to discuss this question of the parity of order in Bishops and Priests on Scripture grounds, what he has to prove is, that in such cases, as for instance that of Timothy when made Bishop of Ephesus, the Apostles, after having ordained men Presbyters, *again ordained them*

The quotation which I have given from our learned Dean Field's *standard treatise* on the Church is dismissed by Mr. Flower (pp. 74—77) with the words, "in spite of your lengthy quotation from Dr. Field," and a passage from Bishop Pearson to refute it, which does nothing of the kind.

And, wonderful to say, he has found out at last that I "concede all that the Bishop of Exeter affirms," (p. 74.) which will no doubt take the reader by surprise. But I am "hypercritical," because I have pointed out an evident proof that the Bishop, in quoting from Thomas Aquinas, was not quoting from the original; and a page and a half (75, 76.) is devoted to a ponderous attempt at joking away a remark, the truth of which he cannot deny. He might well add, "enough of these 'nugæ literariæ.'" For he must, one would suppose, have been heartily sick of such egregious trifling.

The remark respecting the Schoolmen (p. 76), that "they did not as a *body* [his own italics] teach that the power of ordination was a ministerial function inherent in the Presbyterate," when compared with my statement respecting them (Doct. &c., p. 14; Reply to Bishop, pp. 29—31), will serve to shew the reader the character of Mr. Flower's criticism, and with that remark I leave it.

Respecting the relevancy of the Canons of Ecbricht, and the Fourth Council of Carthage (discussed at p. 78), the reader will judge for himself.

But now comes a specimen of the competency of Mr. Flower for the task he has undertaken, of a pretty decisive kind. I mentioned the amusing blunder of Mr. Watson, in confounding the Canons of the Fourth Council of Carthage with what is called the Code of the African Church. He had defended the authority of a Canon of this Council on the ground of its forming part of the African Code. This, Mr. Flower gravely assures us, is *no blunder at all*, for he has discovered that Johnson says, in his *Vade Mecum*, that "in the year 418-19 all Canons formerly made in sixteen Councils held at Carthage, one at Milevis, one at Hippo, that were approved of, were read, and received a new sanction," &c.; and that "this collection is the Code of the African Church;" and concludes in his usual strain: "An amusing blunder certainly has been made, but not by Mr. Watson; for 'mutato nomine de te fabula narratur.'" (pp. 78, 79.)

to a second and higher order of ministry, to which the power of ordination was exclusively attached, and did not simply appoint them to the *office* of presiding over their co-presbyters in a particular church, and of having, of course, in that capacity, the power of ordination so annexed to their office that the imposition of their hands was necessary in every ordination. And in the earliest times a Bishop had no right to ordain anywhere but in his own diocese. This second ordination I take leave to think Mr. Flower never can prove. And it is important to notice, in discussing this subject, that St. Paul, writing to Timothy, when the latter was acting as bishop of Ephesus, admonishes him, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy with the laying on of the hands of the *presbytery*." (1 Tim. iv. 14.) The ordination therefore to which the Apostle refers was to the order of *presbyter*; for though it may justly be inferred from 2 Tim. i. 6. that the Apostle also laid his hands on Timothy, yet if the ordination had been to a higher order than that of Presbyter, Presbyters would have had nothing to do with it. And yet this is the only ordination of which the Apostle speaks as conferred upon Timothy. Now if Timothy had at the time received an ordination of a higher and superior kind, surely the Apostle would have referred to *that* ordination, and not the inferior one previously received.

So that here, even after Mr. Flower's attention has been directed to the subject, he deliberately maintains and defends the blunder, and retorts the charge. Without even looking to see whether the Canon in question is in the African Code, and with the most profound ignorance (as his statement proves) both of that Code and the Canons of the Fourth Council of Carthage, he quotes a passage from Johnson proving nothing on the point in question, and then thinks he has settled the matter, and proceeds to hurl reproaches at his opponent. The slightest research would have told him, that the Canons of what is called the Fourth Council of Carthage are not in the least degree recognised in the African Code. "Silent de hoc Concilio (says Hardouin) Ferrandus Diaconus, Dionysius Exiguus, *codex canonum Ecclesiæ Africanæ*, omnesque canonum collectores." (i. 975, 976.) And the African Code is given by Johnson in the next page to the passage he quotes; so that he might at once have seen, had truth been his object, that the Canon in question was *not* there. Mr. Flower may now, perhaps, be better able to form a judgment how far the "castigation (!) administered by Mr. Watson" was calculated to discompose me; and I suspect Mr. Watson will feel small thanks to be due to his over-zealous friend for drawing fresh attention to such a manifest blunder.

Mr. Flower now "proceeds to the consideration of" my "authorities from Anglican divines." And he commences with the remark, that my "mere words cannot do away with an historical fact," which is as clear as "that the sun shines," namely, "that in their private intercourse with the foreign Reformers, the reception they had met with when in exile influenced the words and conduct of the Elizabethan divines," which he proceeds to prove by the testimony of Crakanthorpe; so that from this cause, and from their fear of Rome, as well as on account of the "great learning and piety" of "many of the foreign Reformers," "it is no wonder that in their private communications" "some expressions of friendship and regard should find place." (pp. 79, 80.)

Such is the way in which Mr. Flower would nullify the force of the warm expressions of respect and regard for the foreign Reformers as valued *fellow-ministers in the Church of Christ*, and for their Churches as pure and reformed Churches of Christ, the true witnesses for Christ on the Continent, which we find in the correspondence of our early divines with the Protestant divines of the Continent. And when Mr. Flower talks of this occurring in their "private correspondence," he is evading the argument he professes to answer; because what we more especially refer to is what occurs in their published works and public acts. Such an answer is in fact an admission of what is contended for, but an attempt to explain it away on grounds incompatible with anything like respect for the character of our Reformers.

A similar evasion is practised by Mr. Flower in meeting the extracts I have given from the works of our divines. The great object which I kept in view in the selection of the extracts I made, was to cite passages that spoke *directly to the point in question*. But this is to my opponents a very inconvenient way of dealing with the subject. Their plan is, to heap together a number of passages from our divines, maintaining the apostolical institution of Episcopacy, and the duties and privileges of the Episcopal office in the matter of ordination, &c., particularly some strong expressions that may have dropped from them when defending Episcopacy against Presbyterianism in controversy,

and then to draw the conclusion,—Therefore they held Presbyterian ordination under all circumstances null and void. I have already noticed, in the course of this controversy,* the erroneous conclusions to which this mode of arguing leads.

But to this mode of arguing Mr. Flower deliberately resorts, citing, from authors whom I have quoted, statements upon the general question to whom “under ordinary circumstances” the power of ordination belongs, and then drawing conclusions as to the sentiments of those authors directly opposed to *their own statements*, as given in the passages I have quoted. And for doing this Mr. Flower plumes himself, as “keeping distinct” two questions which I have “confounded;” (p. 80.) namely, the general question of the claims of Episcopacy, and the particular question of the exceptions to be made in favour of any churches or communities in certain circumstances; two questions which, in fact, I have kept more distinct than is at all convenient to Mr. Flower, and so he mixes them up again. I have cited the testimonies of our divines to the *particular* question now at issue, and not, as Mr. Flower has done, wasted my own and my readers’ time in making extracts from them on the *general* question, and then saddling them, on account of those general statements, with my own deductions as to what their views must have been on *exceptional* cases.

First comes Hooker, with whom Mr. Flower having dealt in this way, coolly adds, “It is evident, if your quotation be genuine [IF YOUR QUOTATION BE GENUINE!], that Hooker *most directly contradicts himself*, and maintains propositions which it is impossible to reconcile.” (pp. 80, 81.) Of course I need not waste any time in defending Hooker against Mr. Flower, or shewing the worse than folly of his charging Hooker with maintaining that in one place which in another in the same work he directly repudiates.

The same treatment is next awarded to Saravia. I have given an extract from him, stating his view on the very point in question. Mr. Flower meets it by extracts on the general question of the claims of Episcopacy, and then says,—“So speaks Saravia.” And to add to his claims on the confidence of his readers, he taxes me with *not doing what I have carefully done*; that is, not “shewing” what the “high ground he took on the subject of Episcopacy” was; which I have expressly done in a note, giving Saravia’s own words; and of which I suspect Mr. Flower’s extract in page 81 is intended to be a translation, and is certainly an incorrect one, by whomsoever made.

So little is Mr. Flower aware of what he has got to prove, or so resolved to mislead the reader, that in reply to my objection to the Bishop of Exeter’s extract from Bishop Bilson, that he was there speaking of *the normal state of the Church*, he replies, “Exactly so; and that is *the real point* to consider in questions of this nature.” (p. 82.) That is, in an inquiry as to the opinions of our divines as to the validity of the orders of certain non-episcopal Churches, we are not to ascertain what they have said upon *the very point in question*, but to go to their general statements as to the claims of Episcopacy, and then set down as their views upon such exceptional cases our inferences from their general statements!

And following out this notion, Mr. Flower again (pp. 82—84) wearies

* See Reply to Churton and Harington, pp. 30, 31.

as with long extracts from Archbishops Whitgift and Hutton upon the general question, which are perfectly useless on the point now at issue ; the extract from Archbishop Whitgift being actually taken from that very letter to Beza in which he acknowledges Beza as "his most dear brother and *colleague* in Christ, and faithful pastor of the Genevan Church,"* and which Strype quotes as shewing Whitgift's "respect for foreign Reformed Churches."†

Next comes Bancroft. Of him Mr. Flower says (p. 85), "He is no advocate for 'parity.'" Neither has he been adduced by me as such. I have quoted only as advocates for "parity" those who have stated themselves to be so. "And claims," adds Mr. Flower, "for the Episcopate something more than a mere human institution." Why so do I, as Mr. Flower well knows from the pages lying before him as he wrote. Of Bancroft I shall of course add nothing to the *proof* I have already given‡ of his maintenance of the validity of the orders of certain foreign Non-Episcopal Churches.

Mr. Flower proceeds to adduce Sutcliffe, of whom, in all the bliss of ignorance, he trippingly observes,—“Of Sutcliffe’s views there is, I believe, no doubt;” and then having quoted a complaint of the Puritan Penry, that he had “defaced foreign Churches,” and given a passage from a controversial work of his against the early Nonconformists, maintaining in strong terms the claims of Episcopacy, he thinks that his business is accomplished, and exclaims in triumph,—“These, then, are an answer to your boastful challenge touching the Elizabethan divines, and, if I am not much mistaken, a sufficient one.” (pp. 86, 87.)

I heartily thank Mr. Flower for reminding me of Dean Sutcliffe. A better proof could not be found than his writings afford of the way in which the maintenance of very high ground on the claims of Episcopacy may be, *and was*, united with a *full recognition of the Non-Episcopal Churches both of the Continent and Scotland, as true Churches of Christ, having every requisite to make them so, according to our 19th Article, the words of which he especially adverts to.* I am about to quote from his treatise, *De vera Christi Ecclesia*. (Lond. 1600. 4to.)

“Homines qui pertinent ad ecclesiam in cœtibus ecclesiasticis videntur : et hujusmodi nos homines ex verbi recta prædicatione et legitima sacramentorum administratione et cultu Christiano veram esse Christi ecclesiam intelligimus. Ideoque et ecclesiam Hierosolymitanam et Antiochenam et Romanam aliasque ecclesias quæ olim fuerunt, vocamus Christi ecclesias, et ecclesiam Anglicanam et Germanicam et Gallicam et Scoticam reliquasque nobis *communione fidei sociatas, non dubitamus veras esse, et ad catholicam seu universalem ecclesiam pertinere.*” (fol. 37, 38.)

And if Mr. Flower wishes to see what Dean Sutcliffe thought of the doctrine of episcopal succession being a note of the Church, he may consult fol. 76—78, and for his opinion upon Mr. Flower’s magisterial *ipse dixit*, that “the ‘quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus’ was the normal standard by which (in subjection of course to Holy Scripture) everything was measured” by our Reformers, (p. 28.) he may see fol. 75 ;§

* See p. 52, above.

† Strype’s Whitgift, ii. 159. Oxf. ed.

‡ Doctrine, &c., p. 34 ; and Reply to Churton and Harington, pp. 15, 16.

§ Intelligere debemus non simpliciter et absolute omnes, sed omnes recte sentientes et credentes. Hujusmodi autem hominum semper insignis erat paucitas. Præterea si omnes omnium temporum ecclesias intelligamus, nemo illam multitudinem videre potest.

which, with their context, (in reply to Bellarmine's notes of the Church,) will probably make him cautious how he again burns his fingers with Dean Sutcliffe.

But I must beg him not to stop here, but to proceed to the last chapter, and if the title is not sufficient for him, to read the whole of it. Thus runs the title,—*Ecclesiam Anglicanam aliasque* (misprinted *aliosque*) *cum ea in Germania, Gallia, Belgio, Scotia, aliisque regionibus communicantes veram et orthodoxam esse Christi ecclesiam.* (fol. 118.)

And one of his first remarks is,—

“Ubi verbum Dei pure et integre prædicatur, et apostolica doctrina et fides recipitur, et sacramenta secundum Christi institutionem rite administrantur, et legitimus Dei cultus servatur, et multi fructus faciunt professioni Christianæ consentaneos, omnesque hæreses et doctrinæ cum verbo Dei et apostolica et prophetica doctrina pugnantes, sacramentaque commentitia, et falsa de sacramentis doctrina, et cultus omnis idololatricus et electitius et superstitiosus rejicitur et condemnatur, &c. . . . ibi est vera Dei ecclesia At hæc omnia facit ecclesia Anglicana, faciuntque illi qui cum ipsa communicant.” (fol. 118.)

“Vera erit et orthodoxa ecclesia, quæ nunc per Angliam et alias regiones nobiscum communicantes secundum verbum Dei fidem Christi profitetur, et sacramentorum institutionem a Christo factam servat, et ita Deum colit et vivit ut ipse præcepit.” (fol. 119.)

And on the point of succession, meeting the reproaches of Stapleton, he remarks :—

“Asserit decimo nos [by *nos* meaning the Protestant Churches] successionem carere. Atque hoc argumento nos graviter torqueri putat : sed falso. Nam in externa successionem, quam et hæretici sæpe habent, et orthodoxi non habent, NIHIL EST MOMENTI. Ne ipsi quidem adversarii de sua successionem, quam tantopere jactant, certi sunt. At nos certi sumus doctores nostros apostolis et prophetis et patribus antiquissimis successisse. Idem etiam, si quid sit in externa successionem ponderis, episcopis et presbyteris per Germaniam, Galliam, Angliam, aliasque regiones successerunt, et ab eis ordinati sunt. Successerunt etiam quoad doctrinam piis illis viris, qui in tenebris synagogæ pontificiæ lucem aspexerunt, et contra ejus corruptelas fortiter prædicarunt.” (fol. 123 vers.)

And on the union of the Protestant Churches among themselves, and their agreement in all the important points of the faith, we may take the following passage ;—“Negat duodecimo, *nos habere unitatem fidei* : et hoc probat testimonio Lindani, &c. . . . Ipsos mentitos esse *harmonia Confessionum* NOSTRARUM docet. Inde enim videre licet ECCLESIAS GERMANICAS, ANGLICAS, GALlicas, SCOTICAS, HELVETIAS, DANICAS, DE FIDE CONSENTIRE.” (ib.)

Such are the statements of a High Church divine of the year 1600 (for such he was in his day), and one of whose concurrence with his opinion about Non-Episcopal Churches Mr. Flower “believes there is no doubt,” and who certainly has spoken as strongly of the claims of Episcopacy as any of the divines whom Mr. Flower has quoted or could quote. Is it too much to hope, that he will at last see the folly of making general statements in favour of the claims of Episcopacy a test of the views of their authors on the question now at issue ?

The truth is, that when Mr. Flower talks so freely about the doctrines of the Elizabethan divines, he is, like most of his party, talking of what he

knows and cares very little about. Will he have the candour of one much his superior in such knowledge, I mean Mr. Maskell, to confess it? I fear not, because the absurdity of denouncing as contrary to the doctrine of our Church views supported by the testimony of the whole stream of our Elizabethan divines, to whom we owe our Formularies almost precisely as they now stand, is so transparent, that some attempt must be made by those who do so to get rid of their testimony.

And these passages of Dean Sutcliffe are instructive in more than one point. They shew us what he would have thought of the interpretation put by the Bishop of Exeter and Mr. Flower on the 19th Article. And above all, they meet at once all that has been said about the absurdity of supposing that the "Church of Scotland" in the 55th Canon of 1604 could be the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. For here we find it placed by Dean Sutcliffe, in 1600, in conjunction with several other Presbyterian Churches, as "communione fidei sociatam" and "communicantem" with the Church of England.

So much for Mr. Flower's indisputable witness, Dean Sutcliffe.

To the assertion, "that Episcopacy, with its distinctive powers, as laid down in a former part of this pamphlet, is of Divine right, has been maintained by the concurrent evidence of all our great divines," I merely reply, that I wish Mr. Flower either more knowledge of what he is writing about, or more consciousness of his ignorance, and nothing more is needed to make him feel thoroughly ashamed of having made such an assertion.

But Mr. Flower invokes the aid of Morinus, who is cited as declaring respecting the opinion that a Bishop is *jure divino* superior to a Presbyter: "*Hæc sententia Catholicis communis est*:" upon which Mr. Flower remarks,—"*This decision common to all Catholics*, I again claim as that of our branch of the Church."

What Mr. Flower "*claims*" is not very material, but what he *proves*; and I might tell him that this passage from a Romish divine can prove nothing as to the doctrine of our Church. But unfortunately Mr. Flower has here committed himself much beyond the mere citation of a passage that proves nothing. Mr. Flower is a great scholar. Scraps of Greek and Latin, and reminiscences of the *Museum Criticum* and Hermann and Porson supply a copious garniture to the dainty dish of criticism he has placed before us. Let him look again. *Hæc sententia Catholicis communis est*. Is it so very hard to construe? Let him, then, consult the context. Perhaps this may give him a useful hint. He will there find that some of the Scholastic doctors held (incorrectly, Morinus thinks,) that a Bishop is superior to a Presbyter only by a regulation of the Church; and that the Council of Trent is stated to have spoken so ambiguously on the point, that one who holds such an opinion cannot be accused of heresy. But, adds Morinus, "*Hæc sententia*"—referring to the *other* opinion—"Catholicis communis est."

I will not offend Mr. Flower by offering to construe it for him. But the reader will observe, that he has not only blundered in his translation of these few words, but, through that blunder, made a misstatement as to the facts of the case. The Romish divines do not *all* hold the doctrine spoken of, nor is it even ruled by the Council of Trent; and the history of that Council shews a good reason for it, as Mr. Flower ought to have known.

Upon the attempt made to nullify Bishop Cosin's testimony (p. 88),

I need make no remark. His testimony may be seen at length in my first pamphlet,* and Mr. Flower's citation cannot explain it away.

The reader may now judge for himself whether it is myself or Mr. Flower that has done the early divines of our Church "a grievous wrong" (p. 88), and misrepresented their real views on the question at issue.

In my first tract on this subject I made the remark, that even those of our early divines who maintained the highest view of the *Jus Divinum* of Episcopacy did not deny the Foreign Non-Episcopal Churches to have the character and essential privileges of Churches of Christ, and consequently their ministers to be true ministers of the Church of Christ; and I proved this by extracts from Bishop Andrews and Archbishop Bramhall.

Mr. Flower now replies (p. 88 et seq.) to this remark; and having given extracts from Andrews, Bramhall, Hall, Davenant, and Crakanthorpe, (whom, by the way, he *will* call Crankanthorpe, see pp. 27, 93,) he attempts to explain away their concessions by urging the "reasons that influenced" them (p. 89), and that they spoke only of cases of "invincible necessity" (pp. 94, 96), such as do not now exist, and that their words applied only to "a temporary, and not a settled, order of things" (p. 95), &c. Now so far as this objection requires an answer, I refer to the extracts I have already given from these divines, to shew how far there is any force in it.† I would especially beg the reader to notice the language of Saravia and Crakanthorpe,‡ the latter of whom expressly says (in a work of which Mr. Flower observes, "I feel for that great man's work as true an admiration as yourself." p. 93), speaking of his wish that the Foreign Protestant Churches would avail themselves of the opportunity they then possessed of obtaining Episcopal orders,— "*sed optamus, non cogimus : jus et imperium in eorum ecclesias nec habemus nos, nec desideramus.*" Saravia likewise evidently contemplated each Church as an independent community that had a right to order its own affairs. And as I have before observed,§ the Foreign Protestant Churches had as good an opportunity for obtaining Episcopal orders in the time of Bramhall, Mason, Cosin, &c. as they have now; so that the objection is palpably invalid; and Mr. Flower's abuse of me, as "sacrificing truth," and "degrading the teaching of" my "own branch of the Church of Christ" (p. 96), only recoils upon his own head.

Mr. Flower's remark about "the probably spurious work of Mason" (p. 93), is an obvious evasion of a conclusive authority utterly destructive of his argument. I have given him *proof* that, whether that work is spurious or not, (and there can be no reasonable doubt of its genuineness,) Archdeacon Mason did "warrant the vocation and ordination of the ministers of the Reformed Churches in foreign parts."|| And here again is another instance of a divine taking the highest ground as to the claims of Episcopacy, as he confessedly does, and being quoted, on account of his so doing, as necessarily opposing the validity of the orders of ministers of Non-Episcopal Churches, yet nevertheless formally and elaborately defending their validity.

* "Doctrine," &c., pp. 39—41.

† See "Doctrine," &c., pp. 32—39.

‡ See "Doctrine," &c., pp. 22, 39.

§ See "Reply to Churton and Harington," pp. 26, 27.

|| "Doctrine," &c., p. 38.

That Stillingfleet "virtually withdrew" his *Irenicum* (p. 93), is—like so many other of Mr. Flower's statements—a random assertion, totally unsupported by the facts of the case. But I will not now detain the reader with a matter of so little importance.

To my question (p. 61, above,) whether the Bishop of Exeter was not a consenting party to the Letter sent by the late Archbishop of Canterbury in 1835, in the name of himself and his "brother Bishops," to Geneva, expressing their "high respect for the Protestant Churches on the Continent," &c., the reply is, that "the Bishop of Exeter has *no recollection* of ever having been contemporaneously informed of the existence of this document, and that he never saw it until last year." (p. 98.) The Bishop does *not remember anything about it*. The reader, therefore, has to choose between the probability of the late respected Archbishop of Canterbury having sent such a letter, in the name of himself and his *brother Bishops*, without having first communicated it to his brother Bishops, or his having communicated it, and the Bishop of Exeter having "no recollection" of it. And there I leave it. It may perhaps serve to illustrate the character of the language Mr. Flower uses in his letter, when I add, that he remarks on my question,—"*I have my own strong opinion that you know that his Lordship was not in any way a party to the document; that his name was not appended thereto, for lithographed circulars were not then introduced at Lambeth; and that you rely on his Lordship's silence for deluding your readers into the error you so pompously and yet so speciously insinuate.*"

In reply to my having reminded the Bishop that at a former period he himself became a member of a committee for aiding the Vaudois pastors, Mr. Flower (p. 98.) "thanks" me for "putting upon record" such a proof of his Lordship's "charitable feelings," and runs off, as might be expected, into some delightful commonplaces about "theological sentiments" not being allowed to "dam up the stream of Christian charity;" and says, that "up to this moment" "he has not withdrawn" his name. There was no need to withdraw his name from that which for years has been all but a dead letter. But Mr. Flower is well aware that his Lordship would no more put his name now on such a committee than on a committee for raising funds for the support of the Dissenting ministers of this country.

Mr. Flower's defence of his Lordship (p. 99) for not protesting against the employment of men not episcopally ordained as ministers and dispensers of the sacraments by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, is utterly insufficient, unless he can shew *that the Society has not done so since 1831*; and this I do not believe he can do.

"The interpretation of the 55th Canon, and the whole question of the Church of Scotland," he says, "I entirely omit." Chancellor Harington's handling of the subject is, of course, being in support of Mr. Flower's views, so "masterly," that "to endeavour to add thereto, were to attempt to *gild refined gold*," and my reply "appears so feeble as to need no consideration." (p. 99.) The respected Chancellor will, I doubt not, appreciate this compliment at its just value. For my own part, I can only say, that, with unfeigned respect for Chancellor Harington, I am perfectly content to leave that controversy as it now stands to the judgment of the public; and the reader will probably agree with me that the extracts given from Dean Sutcliffe, a few pages back, are alone quite enough to settle that question.

And now comes the last point to be noticed in this wearying tissue of misconceptions, misrepresentations, and false reasoning: namely, his reply to my remarks on the Bishop of Exeter's censure of the Ordination Service of the French Reformed Church; and as it touches a matter in which the Bishop of Exeter had deeply committed himself to palpable error, and manifestly shewn his want of sufficient learning to deal correctly with the subject in hand, and all this had been fully demonstrated, there are no words of abusive invective and wrathful scorn sufficient to express Mr. Flower's indignation against me.* Of all these I shall take no notice, but simply deal with the facts of the case. Mr. Flower commences with the gentlemanly accusation of "direct falsification," and adds, "you make the Bishop of Exeter say *what he did not say, but what you wish he had.*" And therefore, to inform his readers what the Bishop of Exeter did "really say," he gives "his words," and then gives word for word the passage I have myself given, and no more, apparently quoting it from my pamphlet, because he has given capitals and italics just as I have given them. If this seems almost incredible, the reader has only to refer to Mr. Flower's pamphlet (pp. 100, 101) to convince himself.

But in *commenting* on the Bishop's words (which I had already given at full length), I remarked, that in them "the Bishop tells us, that the service of the French Church, though it has retained the imposition of hands, yet, by only praying for spiritual gifts, and saying 'whom we now dedicate and consecrate unto Thee by this our ministry,' is *essentially defective*, and the party so ordained has no commission from God, and so, in his Lordship's view, is not really ordained at all." (p. 65 above). And it seems that the storm of abuse is especially directed against my use of the word "defective" in this passage, and I am exhorted to have "some little regard for truth," if I "have none for gentlemanly bearing." (p. 102.) Where Mr. Flower's wits can have betaken themselves when he was writing all this, I know not. But I will not do the reader the injustice of detaining him one moment upon such a senseless outbreak. The very object the Bishop had in view, was to shew, that this service was so *essentially defective*, that it did not pretend to do that which ought always to be done in the conferring of Holy Orders; and I can only hope that in some lucid interval Mr. Flower may be able to see this.

The Bishop's argument was this. The French Form of Ordination does not profess "to confer a commission from God in His name," but only prays for the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit, and dedicates and consecrates unto God the person ordained; whereas in our Ordinal the Ordainer says, "Receive the Holy Ghost," &c., and "professes to confer a commission from God *in His name.*" And therefore we may fairly deny that those ordained by the former have "any

* Mr. Flower actually attacks me (p. 100) for saying (p. 69 above) that I got the Ἀρχιερατικὸν from which I quoted "direct from Constantinople," as if I prided myself on such a fact. If he was a little better acquainted than he is with such matters, he would have known that there is a book published under this name, by the Romanists, which is not trustworthy, which was in my mind when I used the words, though it might certainly have been sufficient to describe the edition. But how any one can pride himself in the present day upon getting a book from Constantinople, I am unable to understand. If, however, Mr. Flower is so rural an ecclesiastic as to think it wonderful, I must submit to his imputations.

commission from God ;" for their "own ordination does not profess to give it."

What the Bishop considers the "*essential* difference" in the two forms, then, is, that the one makes the Form of Ordination to consist in solemn dedication to God, and prayer for the Spirit's aid ; the other (*as the Bishop interprets it*), in an absolute and direct gift by the ordainer, in Christ's name, of the ministerial office, and also of the Holy Spirit for its discharge. Mr. Flower himself states the difference thus : "One claims to give the Holy Spirit, and the other does not." (p. 102.) Precisely so : and in reply to this I shewed that the old Western Ordinals were just of the same kind as the French Form ; not *merely* that the words, "Receive the Holy Ghost," &c., did not occur in them, but nothing equivalent to those words ; and that there was no more anything "professing to confer a commission from God in His name," and to give the Holy Ghost, in *them*, than in the French form ; and therefore, according to the Bishop's argument, "there can be no injustice in denying" that those ordained by them had "any commission from God ;" their "own ordination does not profess to give it." And so, as I said before, the Bishop had (according to his own view of the matter) invalidated the orders of the whole Western Church. For the "difference" is, according to him, "*essential*," and consequently the French form, according to his argument, *essentially defective*.*

* A few words here on the general question may not be out of place. The Bishop's remarks are evidently founded on his notion that no man is properly ordained but by a regular lineal successor of the apostles saying to him, I give you such an office, and assuming to confer upon him the Holy Ghost, and that of such only we can say that they have a commission from God. It is important to observe that the early Ordinals give no countenance to such a notion.

It may be presumed in the case of a person presenting himself for ordination, that there is a call or commission from God of an internal kind, which professed call is acted upon by the Pastors of the Church, who, *as ministers of Christ*, set apart such a person for the ministerial office, and pray for the gifts of the Holy Spirit to qualify him for it ; and then send him forth to his work ; believing that he has a call from God to that work, not because they have ordained him, but from the evidence he had given of having such a call. And he goes to his work with that double call to it, which in ordinary cases is necessary to a regular ministry : a direct call from God internally, and a confirmative external call from the ministers of Christ acting as persons appointed to watch over the interests of Christ's Church, setting him apart for the office, and praying for the Spirit's aid to fit him for the work. Such a one, we may truly say, has a commission from God ; that is, if he has really had that internal call he professes to have had, but not otherwise. And here lies the danger and error of the Bishop's notion ; that, according to it, men are equally commissioned by God to execute the ministerial office, whether they have the internal call from him to execute it or not ; for he makes the existence of the commission to depend upon the gift of the human ordainer, who knows nothing of the heart ; and still further, all, whether worthy or unworthy, are equally recipients of the Holy Ghost, for it is absolutely given by the ordainer to all. Now where there is no internal call, there, I maintain, there is no commission but from man. True, the *outward* commission given by the ministers of Christ is sufficient to render his ministerial acts *valid*, because the ministers of Christ may properly confer such an office in the visible Church. But there is no commission from God, for it is merely through a mistake, arising from human impotency to discern the heart, that the man is ordained at all. Nor is there any gift of the influences of the Holy Spirit, which cannot be given by man, but is conferred by God only according to his own good pleasure.

The notion is part of that Tractarian system of doctrine, so derogatory to the honour of the Divine Majesty, by which the ministers of the Church are made to usurp the place of Christ himself, and represented as having the gifts of the Spirit in their hands to bestow in their ministrations, instead of humbly executing the external ministrations belonging to their office, as men appointed to minister both to the worthy and unworthy, being unable to distinguish between them, but whose

Out of this terrible mishap Mr. Flower seems to think he can rescue his Lordship by a large amount of blustering personalities and abuse, and an attempt to mystify the whole subject. His effort is fruitless. The matter is too plain to be thus obscured. His additional extracts from the forms of prayer found in the old Ordinals (p. 103, 104.) are perfectly useless for his purpose, and only shew that he did not even perceive what the thing to be proved was. What he had got to prove was, that in these ancient Ordinals there were some words in which the ordainer professed to *give, in Christ's name as his representative*, the office to which the person was to be ordained, and the Holy Spirit to fit him for it; whereas he can find nothing but a dedication of the person to be ordained to the office, and prayer that God will accept him and confer the gifts of the Holy Spirit to fit him for the execution of it. The phrases he has italicised in his extracts are wholly irrelevant to the point in question, and prove nothing. But his own words shew that he did not understand what the real question at issue was; for he says, (p. 101) "the real question is . . . do the ancient liturgies shew that orders were of God—that the gifts of the Holy Ghost were then bestowed—and that the ordained were sent forth to minister in his name." Nothing of the kind: but if it were so, the extracts he has given from those Ordinals no more "shew" these things than the French Form of Ordination does. And as it respects the ordained being "sent forth to minister in Christ's name," I have shewn (p. 69, above,) that a Canon of the French Church directs, that "the Assembly remonstrating to him [the person to be ordained] the duty of that office whereunto he is called, shall further declare that power which is *given him in the name of Jesus Christ* to minister both in the Word and Sacraments:" i. e. that the Assembly shall explain to the candidate for ordination the nature of the rite about to be performed. Upon this Mr. Flower remarks, with an obtuseness almost inconceivable, that the Canon is "conclusive against" my "argument," for it uses the words "is given," and "the ordination *follows*." (p. 102, *note*.) I can only hope that when Mr. Flower is a little cooled from his excitement he will be able to make a better use of his understanding.

The vulgar abuse that follows (p. 108) I leave to answer itself, and to the long extracts from Dr. Hickes, with which Mr. Flower concludes, shall merely reply, that he who gathers his views of the doctrines of the Church of England from such divines as the Nonjuror Dr. Hickes, need not be surprised that his censures make but a small impression upon those attached to her genuine tenets. If he is anxious to emulate their fame, he has succeeded admirably, for I know not any of the productions of Hickes and Dodwell that would entitle their author better than this of Mr. Flower to the appellation bestowed upon the former by the able and excellent Archbishop Wake. He has well earned the honour of being acknowledged as their successor as one of the "*furiosi scriptores*" of the present day.

ministrations are accompanied by a Divine blessing only in the case of the former; and are not *then* generally the means of the first bestowal of the blessing, but rather a recognition of its bestowal by those to whom the superintendence of Christ's Church on earth has been confided, and a reception of the subject of their ministrations in that capacity to which the blessing received entitles him, and no doubt instrumental in such a case to its increase.

